Columbia University
in the City of New York

THE LIBRARIES

Bequest of
Frederic Bancroft
1860-1945

E

WORKS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index
under the direction of

THE MOST REVEREND SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER
Archbishop of Milwaukee

With Portraits

VOLUME V

Cleveland, Ohio
The Arthur H. Clark Company
1908

976
E 34
v. 5

COPYRIGHT 1908, BY

THE ARTHUR H. CLARK COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

376226

NEWBERRY
LIBRARY

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

PART IV. ESSAYS [CONCLUDED].

Catholic Voters	9
Vindication of Judge Gaston	55
Catholic Schools	67
The Jansenist Schism	75
Episode of Mr. Ward and Mr. Poinsett	80
Catholic Superstition	88
Ignorance of Catholic Tenets	94
The Term "Catholic"	98
The Religion of American Indians	104
Descent of Æneas to the Shades	160
Domestic Slavery	183
Ceremonies of the Mass	312
Ceremonies of Holy Week	395
Penitential Austerities	474
Liberality	501

PART IV

ESSAYS

(*Concluded from Volume IV*)

CATHOLIC VOTERS

[The series of articles which follows, was occasioned by the effort made by the editor of a leading political journal, to identify Bishop England and the Catholic voters of the United States with one of the political parties of the day, and to charge upon them both the practice of corrupt means for advancing its interests, and also a participation with the European governments in a scheme for the overthrow of the republican institutions of their country. The articles were evidently written by Bishop England, speaking of himself as of another person,—a journalistic license. They appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, Vol. XX., for 1840. The two short pieces added, under the same head, are extracted from Nos. 25 and 27 of the same volume.]

SECTION I

Catholic Voters: We have seen the letter of Bishop England, upon which the editor of the *Baltimore Pilot and Transcript*, Mr. Duff Green, who is a writer favourable to the election of General Harrison to the Presidency, has fastened his commentary. It is more than a month since we read the letter upon a Georgia paper. We found it did not contain anything religious, anything Catholic, anything which called for insertion in our columns, and we did not therefore copy it; indeed we had determined not to give it a place in our paper, which is altogether a Catholic religious publication. It has gone the round of many of the secular journals, and we had let it fall from our memory, until we found that Mr. Green contrived to give it a religious complexion, and to make it the occasion for what we consider a very uncalled for aggression upon the Catholics.

In his paper of the 3d of September, Mr. Green prefaces the introduction of the letter by an article which we shall give, after the letter itself shall be spread before our readers. Its history is brief. Bishop England was on his visitation in the city of Columbus, in Muscogee county, in Georgia, in the month of July. The place was almost driven to frenzy by the devices of electioneering; amongst other topics that caused great excitement, was one which attributed all the miseries of the country, real and imagined, to the present administration; and it was urged that if the opposing candidate was elected, the country would be in a most prosperous condition. People were drawn away to all sorts of political meetings, for and against, to distant places, to the ruin of their morals, and to the injury of their property; and they were as-

sured by men of talents and of eloquence, that the support of their particular party was the only way of getting out of their difficulties. The expectation, founded upon this mode of paying debts and of getting rich, became a mania through the country. Several persons called upon the Bishop, as they did upon many others, to learn his and their opinions. He avoided interfering between the opposite candidates, though as a citizen of nearly twenty years standing, and at least sufficiently aged to form an opinion, he had as good a right to take a side as any other citizen has. His own flock, and other persons who differed with him in religion, made the appeals indiscriminately. He was invited to a barbecue, by a committee deputed from a respectable meeting; that committee brought him a written invitation, and he felt that he ought to give a written reply.

He did not feel that it would be proper for him to attend, but he also felt that he owed some courtesy to those who had invited him. He, therefore, took occasion, after explaining the grounds for his declining to meet them, to say that which he still believes to be the fact—that the distress of the lands is not the result of having one party in power, and will not be removed by a change of administration. He said, moreover, that some of the most eminent citizens were of a different opinion. Was this making a Catholic party? We know some most respectable Catholics who think as these eminent men do, and who differ with the Bishop, but with whom Bishop England is upon the most intimate footing, not only of friendship, but of religion. Is this a Catholic political party? The Bishop, without reference to party, stated, what he still believes, that much of the distress was caused by avaricious, miscalculating, unprincipled speculation; by vain ostentation, by dissipation, and, he thought, the remedy was to be found in habits of industry, economy, and persevering frugality. For our part, we think it became any man who was asked his opinion to say so much, if such was really his conviction. Does Mr. Green think it unbecoming in a bishop to recommend industry, economy, and frugality?

The Bishop, moreover, earnestly recommended to a community maddened by stump orators, and set by the ears at each other, by declamations which were for the most part froth and falsehood, to lay aside unkind feelings—to allow that mutual freedom of thought and action which is congenial to good republican simplicity; to vote as before God they should deem best for the good of the country, and peaceably to abide the result of the ballot-box. Does Mr. Green consider this unbecoming language for a Catholic bishop? We do not.

The obnoxious letter is thus printed:

"COLUMBUS, July 25, 1840.

"*To John H. Howard, Esq., Chairman, and the other members of the committee, Democratic citizens, Muscogee county.*"

"*Gentlemen*:—I have been honoured by your invitation to attend, on Tuesday next, at the feast to be given in honour of certain distinguished citizens of Georgia and Alabama, by the Democratic citizens of Muscogee county.

"Generally speaking, I should feel it would be more prudent for me to unite with my fellow-citizens only at the ballot-box, in using my right as a member of the republic, to approve or to censure the conduct of those to whom we entrust the guardianship of our liberties. On the present occasion, I feel the additional force of a monition given by my brethren at the last council, (a few months since,) upon this very subject, in a pastoral letter. I trust, then, that my respectfully declining your invitation, will not be considered as wanting in courtesy to you. The body to which I belong professes to be one of peace and conciliation; should its members unite actively with political parties mutually opposed, while each declares that it seeks only the prosperity of our republic, their capacity to promote peace and conciliation would be at an end. You will feel that the influence of such a ministry of good-will would, in our present state of excitement, be useful, if not necessary, and I am sure you will approve of the determination by which I am bound. I think, however, I may venture to say that the best remedy for our present unfortunate position is to be found in preferring industry to speculation, labour to cabal, economy to ostentation, patient and persevering frugality to dissipation. I, therefore, consider that man who aids in making our lands productive, to be our most useful citizen; I regard the laborious, well-conducted mechanic, as preferable to the speculator in stocks, or to the usurer. The former creates the wealth of a nation—the latter endeavours to get into its possession, under the pretext of its management; I also believe that our federal government has had as little influence in producing the present distress in our states, as it had in producing that which afflicts Europe; and that it has as little power to alleviate that distress as it has constitutional right to interfere with its causes.

"Some of our most eminent citizens have expressed deliberate opinions widely different from mine. I have given full consideration of their reasoning, but cannot come into their conclusions. In one point, however, I should hope we could all unite. That laying aside unkind feelings, bitterness, strife, and mere partisan attachments, we should endeavour to bring back our habits of good republican simplicity, and zealous for our country's good, endeavour, by the peaceable process of the ballot-box, to place in the administration of our government those citizens whom, in the presence of God, we shall conscientiously regard as the best qualified to promote the general good, by the sacrifice of predilections, by preserving us in peace and safety in our domestic relations, in our sacred homes, and maintaining us in full possession of our rights, having our commerce untrammelled by monopoly, by sectional preferences, or by facilities created by the use of the public purse, and by sustaining us in our strength, by having the bond of our Union most firmly interwoven by our affections, so as to secure to us the respect and confidence of the world abroad. It is the good of our country which requires that we should endeavour to unite all our fellow-citizens for this desirable object. Let us endeavour, by an affectionate interchange of views, to effect it.

"Believe me to be, with sentiments of high esteem, your obliged fellow-citizen,

"†JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

We now ask whether this letter, written under such circumstances, be a crime, the perpetration of which should give great pain to Mr. Duff Green? Even Mr. Green himself avows that the Bishop's expressions are "correct of themselves." What, then, caused Mr. Green to "regret the publication of the letter?" "Because the expressions will be connected with the political and party discussions." Now we are authorized to say that, with the publication of the letter, Bishop England has just as little concern as had General Green. The connexion of the expressions with political and party discussion, so far as we have seen, is altogether the work of Mr. Duff Green, and certainly not imputable to the bishop.

"Because the expressions will receive an interpretation conveying unmerited inputations, calculated to blend religious faith with party zeal, and thus embitter a political controversy already too much excited." The interpreter is the person chargeable with this, and that interpreter is Mr. Duff Green, and not the writer of the letter, whose expressions were "correct of themselves."

Mr. Green's commentary is the following:—

"BISHOP ENGLAND'S LETTER.

"A friend has called our attention to the letter of Bishop England, published in the *Republican*, of Monday. We insert it below.

"To those who know us, we need not say that the perusal has given us great pain. We are aware that there is a deep and abiding prejudice against Catholicism, and that many believe there is a well arranged plan on the part of Catholic monarchies in the world, to revolutionize our government, by the introductions of Catholic emigrants.

"The Protestant community have been warned, as well from the pulpit as from the press, that the money expended in getting up schools, as well as that used in sending pauper, and other Catholic population to this country, is part of a system which, looking to the nature of our institutions, contemplates a great religious as well as civil revolution, by the means of imported Catholic votes. It is also believed, that the publication of Van Buren's letter to the Pope got him Catholic votes at the late election. It was, therefore, with great pleasure that we read the pastoral letter addressed to the Catholics, as a body, admonishing them to moderation in political discussions. It was under the influence of the perusal of that letter that our article, in reference to the act of the lord proprietors establishing religious toleration in Maryland, was penned. That article has brought us more than one letter, calling upon us to open our press, against the Catholic influence, and one imputing our not doing so, to a desire to conciliate Catholic votes. We have forborne to notice these letters, because, until the result of the Illinois elections, and this letter of Bishop England, we had seen nothing in the progress of the canvass, to justify a belief that any attempt to bring the Catholics as a body to vote for Mr. Van Buren, would receive the countenance of the Catholic clergy, or of any distinguished member of that body.

"We regret the publication of this letter, because there are those who will find

in it, considering the relation which Bishop England bears to the Pope and to the Catholics of this country, (it is said, that he has been designated by the Pope, 'as Inquisitor-General of the United States,') a confirmation of their worst fears, and because we greatly regret that one occupying so important a place in the Catholic church, should have used expressions, which, however correct of themselves, will be connected with the political and party discussions, and receive an interpretation, conveying unmerited imputations, calculated to blend religious faith with party zeal, and thus embitter a political controversy, already too much excited.

"While speaking on this subject, we take the occasion to say, that whatever may be the dreams of religious enthusiasts abroad, we have no apprehension that any scheme to establish any sectarian religion in this country, can ever prevail. Where there is so much zeal and system, it would be surprising if the Catholic clergy abroad, did not avail themselves of the wide field presented to them in the fertile regions of the West, to extend what they believe to be the true faith. It is the principle on which other Christian denominations act, and they have as much right as Protestants to erect schools, to send out missionaries, and to digest schemes of proselytism. This is their duty, and so long as the Catholic clergy believe that theirs is the true faith, they will exert themselves to extend that faith. It is only when we find those who exercise a spiritual control, like that of Bishop England, putting aside his priestly robes, and entering the field of politics, as he has done in this instance, that we feel called upon to examine how far that spiritual control is calculated to exercise an undue influence over the minds of men, and to call upon all good Catholics, as well as Protestants, to resist it. We are the advocates of toleration. We are for toleration in politics as well as in religion; but we cannot close our eyes to the fact, that the elections in Illinois have been carried for the administration by the imported Catholic voters. We cannot close our eyes to the fact, that Mr. Van Buren is in a condition to make any sacrifice to secure his re-election, and that his partisans in Illinois, have obtained this foreign Catholic aid, by an appeal to the passions and prejudices of men whose residence in the country had not qualified them to understand our institutions; and they were permitted to vote, before they had become citizens, or relinquished their allegiance to a foreign government.

"We will add a word more. We are sensible that no political press in this city has dared to speak out on this subject, under a belief that the effect would be to prejudice the private interest of the publisher, and to drive the whole Catholic vote over to Mr. Van Buren. We are sure—we know that there are timid and time-serving Protestants of our own party, who will be frightened and censure us. We act upon no such principle. In the first place, we believe that there are many Catholics who concur with us in all our regrets at the publication of this letter, who will admit the justice of our remarks, and who will regret it no less on account of its tendency to injure the Catholic cause, than for any bearing it may have on politics. We are not prepared to say how far it may operate on Catholic voters, but we are prepared to do our duty, as the conductor of a free press, regardless of such influence. The candid of his own admirers cannot but see in Bishop England's letter, and the circumstances to which we refer, a justification for all we have said, and more."

This commentary contains an assault upon Bishop England, for an assumed partisanship against the party of Mr. Green, which the Bishop positively did not commit, unless Mr. Green will assert that this party is deservedly characterized as noted for "speculation," "cabal," "osten-

tation," "dissipation," for "usury," "monoply of commerce," "and seeking to create sectional preferences and facilities, by the use of the public purse." It is not for us to say that the General is unacquainted with his employers: but so far as we can perceive, Bishop England has indeed denounced bad practices, but did not attribute them to either of the parties engaged in the contest, that task he has left to those whose better acquaintance with the perpetrators qualifies them better for its discharge.

But suppose the Bishop had "put aside his priestly robes, and entered into the field of politics," as Mr. Green asserts he has done in this instance, why does the General again clothe him in those robes? Why not assail him without thus covering him with what he had put off? Is it not manifest that the object was to mangle the robes under the pretext of merely wounding the politician? To strike Dr. England, would be a poor vengeance; but to strike, and to wound, and to oppress the Catholic body of the United States, is quite another achievement.

Bishop England wrote a letter, the expressions of which were "correct in themselves"—but the State of Illinois thought proper to support a Governor, not of Mr. Green's party—and because a few Catholics happen to be in Illinois, it is a Catholic conspiracy! Therefore it is, that Mr. Green not only clothes Bishop England with the "priestly robes," that he had just laid aside, but has recourse to the paltry trick of insinuating, what even he himself would not have the hardihood to assert, that the Pope gave to Bishop England the office of "Inquisitor-General of the United States."

The criminality of the Bishop then consists in having written the letter above given, and no more—and that of General Green consists in giving to the letter his interpretations, and in calumniating the Bishop and the Pope, by insinuating a known falsehood, which he was aware would be palpable to his employers. So far for Bishop England. But what an account has the General opened with the Catholic body, not only of the United States, but of Europe.

We must leave its examination for our next number.

SECTION II

Threat of Extirmination: We beg our readers to look to the advice given by General Duff Green, to our fellow-citizens, which is substantially that they should watch the result of the elections in every district, where there was a large number of Catholics, and if in that district there was a majority for Mr. Van Buren, then that the Cath-

olics should be extirminated, and their religion proscribed. Nor was this a hasty effusion; the General wrote it some days after he had written another article of a similar character; he wrote and published deliberately. Let us now put a case to illustrate and show the practical effect of his principle.

In this city there is a large Catholic population; there can be no question but that even if every Catholic stayed from the polls, and that there was an election before the citizens to-morrow as to whether General Harrison, or Mr. Van Buren should be President, the almost unanimous vote of the city would be in favour of Mr. Van Buren. Thus without a single vote of a Catholic, the result would be produced. It is probable that Catholics will vote, yet that vote would not change the result. We know that a few Catholics, perhaps three or four, openly avow their preference for General Harrison. They are upon the same standing in their church as their fellow-members are, who avow a different preference, they have the same religious rights and facilities, and are upon the same friendly footing with their clergy; they use without suffering any inconvenience, their unquestionable right of citizens.

In what does the crime of the Catholics consist, that they shall be extirminated?

We shall give another instance, and point out not a supposition, but a fact. There is a large body of Catholics in the city of Savannah, in Georgia. An election for municipal officers, was held there about twelve days since, upon each of the two opposed tickets there were the names of two Catholics, each of the four actually was or had been a member of the vestry. We know that at least one of each of the tickets is now in that office, and is a regular partaker of the sacraments, all are intimate friends of their pastor, and of Bishop England. The election turned precisely upon the preference for Van Buren or Harrison: this, and only this, was the ground of contest: the tickets proved that it was a strict party vote. The Van Buren ticket succeeded by an average majority of 81. According to General Green's principle, the Catholics of Savannah should be extirminated and their religion proscribed! —The Catholics of Savannah? No, but the whole body of Catholics throughout the United States. And this is the republicanism and the toleration of General Duff Green, and his supporters!—We do not charge it upon the party that employs him, though we have long known that it is the principle of vast numbers of that party, yet we also know it is reprobated by a large number who are honestly opponents to the Democratic party, who love republicanism, and who would show, if necessary, their hatred of persecution by rallying even in the field of fight to pre-

vent the extirmination of the Catholics. It is, therefore, we do not consider it the principle of the party, though cherisheed and fostered by men high amongst them, but published only by a few.

We believe, for our own part, that even the General himself would not wage this war of extirmination—we look upon his production in another light more insulting but less malevolent. We consider it as intended to work upon the fears of cowards rather than to proclaim what he intended to have done. We may be wrong; perhaps he intended to do what he described. With that we have no concern. The General and his troops may begin as soon as he pleases,—nor need the Catholics lift a fiinger in their own defence: the spirit of Boston is not that which influences the Union. We are safe under the protection of our Protestant fellow-citizens. We are safe under the guardianship of those who are neither Catholic or Protestant. We are safe under the protecting genius of our free institutions. We have no fears, though it has been fashionable to insult us; and still we are treated with a contumely which is flung upon no other portion of our fellow-citizens; but Catholics themselves are greatly to blame, for they have frequently exhibited too much of the spaniel, and whilst they continue so to do, will receive that obloquy which is due to what is meanness of character, but not the humility of religion.

The Protestants have good sense enough to know that the safety of each sect and the preservation of religious liberty consist, not in the destruction of the Catholics, but in the immediate and uncompromising destruction of such a principle as General Green recommends; a principle which would destroy the Catholic this year, the Methodist the year after:—the Baptist, the Protestant Episcopalian, and every other would follow, unless each should sustain the heartless partisan politician, with or without his conscientious approval, or he must together with his religion become the victim of the extirminator. Such is the doctrine which Protestants are invoked to carry into practice, that General Harrison may get Catholics votes!

The most insolent passage in General Green's production is that in which he boasts of patronising Catholics—because he sent his children to their schools!

We suppose he paid and they taught, and if he knew of a better school he would have sent the children thither, as he ought.

SECTION III.

Catholic Voters: We continue this designation, though the subject

is not now precisely the same as that with which we commenced. We do so without reference to the election of either General Harrison or of Mr. Van Buren, and without any regard to any political party, though, as we before observed, the spirit of which we complain is diffused far more extensively in one of the present parties, than it is in the other,— Yet as it is not an ingredient of the party politics, but an accidental appendage, we do not charge it upon that party.

We complain that an insulting distinction is habitually made between the Catholics and their fellow-citizens; the Catholics are denounced as enemies to their country, as the tools of foreign monarchs, as dangerous to the existence of our liberties. This, even General Green testifies. In his article of September 3d, he has the following passage:—

"We are aware that there is a deep and abiding prejudice against Catholicism, and that many believe there is a well-arranged plan on the part of Catholic monarchies in the old world to revolutionize our government by the introduction of Catholic emigrants."

General Green thus acknowledges what we believe no person who knows this country will attempt to deny, that throughout the United States there is a deep and abiding prejudice against our religion. That is, in plain language, that there exists a deep spirit of hostile bigotry against Roman Catholics. The General goes farther, for he points out the emigrant portion of the Catholics as the most obnoxious, and he gives the cause of that greater hostility, because it is pretended that they have been introduced by the monarchs of Europe, or their agents, into this country, to produce a revolution. This is a serious charge, not made by the editor of the *Baltimore Pilot and Transcript*, but testified by him as existing.

The charge has been made during years in a variety of ways by the sectarian papers. We now take up the three first which are at hand, merely as specimens.

From a short article in the *Christian Intelligencer*, we select the following passages. It is headed "Matters for Protestants to Think on."

"That the Romish religion is a corruption of Christianity, superstitious, idolatrous, and tyrannical, and that its predominance is a thing to be deprecated and resisted, are not matters of doubtful disputation with Protestants."

"From the very assumption and claims of the Popish Church, it must of necessity, and as a matter of conscience, be a persecuting church; and such its whole history proves it to be."

"That a mighty effort is at the present time put forth, with great sagacity and perseverance, by the papal authorities, with the view of extending their influence in Protestant countries, no observer of the signs of the times can fail to perceive. The evidences of it are every where apparent."

"Our country is inundated with popish ecclesiastics and emissaries. No effort is spared to gain to the utmost the control of education throughout the length and breadth of the land. There is a deference, on the part of political men, to popish prejudice and projects of a striking and peculiar kind, and of no auspicious omen."

This is from a New York paper, and after alluding to the claim of the Catholics of that city to get their share of the school fund, with power to educate their own children, or to secure that they shall not in the public schools, be taught to despise their own religion, and after misrepresenting the nature of the claim, it continues—

"It is not our wont to indulge in hard words, and it gives us pain to find occasion to speak as we have done—but this project, viewed in its various bearings, and in the manner in which it is prosecuted, appears to us to be monstrous and audacious —and in connexion with other indications, calls for the vigilance of all who prize the perpetuity of our precious liberties, civil and ecclesiastical."

The usual mode of concluding their tirades against us to say that they are not in the habit of using harsh language, but with respect to us it is unavoidable.

The *Christian Observer*, published in Philadelphia, on the 10th of this month, says—

"There is, however, occasion to notice the movements of ecclesiastics of the Romish faith, that Protestants who appreciate the liberties of their country may be awake to the devices and plans prosecuted in the republic by the subjects of a foreign power."

The *New York Observer* says—

"The citizens of this republic cannot be too watchful of the movements of Roman Catholics in their midst. The wiles of Jesuitism are too subtle to be detected by a careless eye, and the progress of Popery may be so slow and insidious that, before we are aware of it, the throne of the beast may be planted on the shores of America, and the religion of Antichrist be the religion established by law.—That such are the designs of the emissaries of the Pope we have too much reason to fear. All they ask is the opportunity, and they would fasten on us, by the strong arm of government, the system that kings have shaken off, and which now seeks to enthrone itself in a land of liberty."

We could add thousands of extracts far more strong and explicit, by merely looking back through our files:—but there is no necessity, because it is conceded on all hands that this insulting distinction between Catholics and their fellow-citizens exists.

We again adduce General Green, as a witness, to show more distinctly the nature of the charge. In his first article of September 3d, he says—

"The Protestant community have been warned, as well from the pulpit as from the press, that the money expended in getting up schools, as well as that used in sending pauper and other Catholic population to this country, is part of a system which, looking to the nature of our institutions, contemplates a great religious, as well as civil revolution by means of imported Catholic votes."

Now, so far as relates to the charge of the Catholics contemplating a change in religious as well as in civil matters, we admit that the General gives a very fair representation of the unfounded assertions of the prejudiced accusers,—but although we have attentively perused the tirades that for years have been printed and circulated upon this subject, we must avow that we have no recollection of any charge made upon either the Catholics of Europe or those of the United States, that they expended money in sending or bringing hither a Catholic population; for it is a notorious fact that the Catholic immigrants paid their own expenses. They themselves, and not agents of others, bargained at the foreign ports and paid the passage money,—and we defy any one to prove any agency but that of the individuals themselves. We shall for the present hold the opinion that this is a gratuitous assertion of General Green, to subserve purposes of a party, until he shall have shown evidence that this was previously and openly charged.

He especially states that this money was spent in bringing hither Catholic pauper population. The General has been guilty of wantonly inflicting the grossest insult upon the great body of Catholics in the United States, unless he can show the truth of two propositions, neither of which is true.

1. That Catholic paupers were sent hither. 2. That it was commonly and generally charged that they were sent hither by the Catholics of Europe. We may add—3. That they were sent by them for the purpose of revolutionizing our institutions.

We dislike retorts, but we must here give the General what he richly deserves. The only imported paupers that we ever have known sent to these United States, were Protestant paupers, sent by the Protestant overseers of the Protestant workhouses of Protestant England, in order to save their own good Protestant country the expense of supporting its own Protestant paupers. Our Protestant brethren will perceive that this is no assault upon them: it is but a gentle admonition to a liberal patron of Catholic schools, who is justly desirous to procure for his children the best education, to be cautious how he insults Catholic immigrants. We well remember the commotion created in some of our northern States at discovering the ragged, the wretched, the maimed, the lame, the decrepid and the sickly hordes of this unwelcome accession from "the bulwark of Protestantism."—We fully concur in the propriety, as we have witnessed the efficacy, of the American remedy. The poor creatures were reshipped, and sent to the doors of their heartless exporters. We desire that when a cargo of Catholic paupers may be

landed on our shores, they who sent them may have them in like manner returned upon their hands.

But who are they whom the General styles, paupers?—They are the bone and sinew, the nerve and muscle of the country; they are the men who give unceasing labour in return for common wages, but upon whom the generosity of General Green's associates bestows more than they bargained to receive. Yes, for they bestow obloquy, they bestow insult to themselves, reproach to the country of their birth, vituperation to the religion of their choice, and their best efforts to keep them helots during life; to allow them the enviable privilege of seeing themselves surrounded by men enjoying political and civil rights without being permitted a hope of ever becoming citizens themselves. This is more than their contract required.

We know also, that not unfrequently they have been swindled and cheated of the money they contracted to receive, and when worn down with toil, and maddened by disappointment, destitute of friends, bereft of the aid of religion, and provoked by the sarcasms and false charges upon themselves, their religion, and the land of their nativity, they violated the peace, but were appeased by the remonstrances of a priest, the very associates of General Green in his present partisanship, were the first to complain of this undue influence, as destructive to our liberties by substituting the priest for the constable, and teaching foreigners rather to bow before the shrine of a "false church," than before the tribunal of justice,—thus introducing the spirit of clerical despotism on one side, and of abject slavery on the other.

We recollect the story of an unfortunate man who was subjected to the lash of a drummer: when he was cut under the shoulder-blade, it was too high, the touch on the loins was too low, and the unfortunate executioner finding him equally out of humour with all sorts of whipping, resolved to follow his own judgment—so with the haters of our Catholic paupers. If the imported voter is turbulent, he is a riotous foreigner, if he listens to the voice of religion, he is a popish slave. If the labourer be disposed to hear us, we will say to him,—"Do as the drummer did:—Follow the dictates of your own judgment. These men do not love you, and will not love you!—Have Christian charity for them, and care as little for them, as we do; that is, just nothing. Hold to your religion and to the republic, and be independent of those who in truth fear you, though they affect to despise you." We leave to the recollection of General Green himself, the contemplation of what he said and wrote on a former occasion to excite anything but sympathy for those hard working Catholic paupers.

The men whom General Green has dared to call paupers, and whom his associates habitually stigmatize, are they who have built our cities, dug our canals, levelled our railroads, laboured in our mines, felled our forests, and cultivated our soil. These are the men who create the wealth of a nation, and who can if necessary, maintain the rights of the country in the face of her foes: but they are paupers? Catholic paupers, and they must be driven from the ballot-box, lest these imported Catholic voters should at the beck of the monarchs of Europe, destroy our free institutions!

Again we adduce General Green as a witness. In his article of Sept. 7, he says—

"The Catholics of Ireland, and in the United States, are lovers of liberty for the sake of liberty. They are the weaker and the persecuted sect: and although under other circumstances they would be monarchists, in the United States they are advocates of freedom and of republican institutions."

Yes, these are paupers, the imported Catholic paupers, who are to be the instruments in the hands of the monarchs of Europe, to destroy our free institutions! And who therefore are not to be admitted to the polls. And who are to enjoy also the enviable prerogative, that if, at the present election, Mr. Van Buren obtains a majority in any place where the Catholics are numerous, the Protestants are to be invoked by the agent of the party opposed to the said Martin Van Buren to oppose Romanism! This is a proud distinction. The Catholics, the pauper Catholics, the imported Catholics, should manifest their gratitude for this insult by voting against the said Martin Van Buren.—But there is a stronger reason than all others why they should vote against Martin Van Buren. It is because when every one else called the head of their church "a beast"—"a great beast," "a monster with a cloven foot," "the enemy of God," "Anti-Christ," and a "foul thing, an unclean thing," Martin Van Buren had the consummate impudence to write, as Secretary of State, to the American Consul at Rome, an official letter in which he used in relation to the Pope the language of courtesy and respect that is usual in all diplomatic intercourse between the officers of civilized governments.

Can any comment of our letters show the insolent spirit with which Catholics are treated?—We shall resume the subject.

SECTION IV

Catholic Voters:—Before leaving the charge made upon the Catho-

lics, of filling the land with their paupers, we shall draw General Green's attention to a few additional facts.

The corporations of our seaports are very careful in requiring bonds and good security from the masters of all vessels that bring foreign passengers to their wharves, to insure payment of any expenses to which alms-houses, poor-houses, or hospitals may be put by such passengers for a considerable period after their arrival. In most places the captains, finding this not a very pleasant nor a very safe mode of dealing, procured that, in lieu of the bond, a composition should be struck, generally from two to ten dollars per head. Inquiries have been made in Boston, New York, and other places, and upon investigation it has been demonstrated that a yearly profit of several thousand dollars was made by the city, by means of the composition thus levied upon those foreign Catholic paupers, as they have been insolently called.

We have made inquiry in this city, and been informed by respectable commissioners of the poor-house, that it seldom happens, except in case of sickness, that one of those "Catholic imported voters," is found upon their list. In this state, being on the roll of the poor-house would operate as a disfranchisement. So far, then, from being a burden upon the country, the country taxes them upon their arrival, taxes them upon declaring their intention to become citizens, and taxes them a third time in being admitted to citizenship. And yet they are "imported paupers!"

We have inserted on our columns this day an article from the *Lutheran Observer*, the editor of which appears to us to claim the authorship of the offensive paragraphs to which General Green gave currency by copying them, affecting only to give the sentiments of others, without adopting them himself. We wish the happy pair joy in their union.

General Green charges Bishop England with having sought to influence the Catholics as a body to vote for Mr. Van Buren.

"We have forborne to notice these letters, because, until the result of the Illinois elections, and the letter of Bishop England, we had seen nothing in the progress of the canvass to justify a belief that any attempt to bring the Catholics, as a body, to vote for Mr. Van Buren would receive the countenance of the Catholic clergy, or of any distinguished member of that body."—*Pilot* of September 3.

"It is only when we find those who exercise a spiritual control like that of Bishop England, putting aside his priestly robes, and entering the field of politics as he has done in this instance, that we feel called upon to examine how far that spiritual control is calculated to exercise an undue influence over the minds of men, and to call upon all good Catholics, as well as Protestants, to resist it."—*Ibid.*

Let us now examine what havoc the Bishop has made in the field

of politics, and how he has called upon the Catholics, as a body, to vote for Mr. Van Buren.

General Green gives those proofs in his paper of the 7th of September. We shall give them in order. First. A son of the Secretary of State, who publishes a paper in Mobile, prints the Bishop's letter, and marks part of it in italics, to prove that the Bishop is for the administration.

Therefore, the Bishop has entered the field of politics, having put off his priestly robes; and thus divested of the symbol of his spiritual character, he wields his spiritual influence to induce the Catholics, as a body, to vote for Martin Van Buren.

Who will deny that General Green is an admirable logician? How clearly is his conclusion contained in his premises?

Proof the second.—The *Baltimore Sun* enlightened the monumental city with the letter similarly italicised.

Therefore—

The Council of Baltimore told the Catholics that each voter was bound in conscience to prefer the public good to his private interest in voting for public officers; and that each voter was to act an independent honest part, according to the dictates of his own conscience. The council moreover told them that the bishops themselves had different views, and had no right nor wish to influence the vote of any man. Bishop England was one of thirteen who subscribed to this declaration.

The opponents of Mr. Van Buren proclaimed that all the mischief which afflicts the land, and all that is imagined to be in existence has been produced by Mr. Van Buren; Bishop England being asked if such be his opinion, says that he thinks Mr. Van Buren did not produce it, but that many very great men say that he did, but yet the Bishop's opinion is not changed.

Therefore, though the Bishop never alluded to religion, nor to voting, he is guilty of endeavouring to get the Catholics, as a body, to vote for Mr. Van Buren. Such is the logic of General Green!

Now, Bishop England is the champion of Catholicism, and all the Catholics will follow him. This is another of the General's proofs. Yet in the very same article he informs us, that he is sustained in his assault upon Bishop England by "the intelligent Catholics of Baltimore, and especially by the eminent Catholic clergymen" of that city, who do not consider an attack upon Bishop England to be an attack upon the Catholic religion. We never said it was; but we do say that [talking about] foreign Catholic paupers, was; that insinuating that they were sent hither by the monarchs of Europe to destroy our liberties, was; that

insinuating that the Catholic votes of this Union were in the pocket of the Pope's inquisitor, was; and we will demonstrate, that grossly as General Green has insulted Bishop England, he has treated the "eminent Catholic clergymen" of other places worse.

Did General Green believe that the Catholics were so slavishly subservient to their "champion," when, on the 7th of September, he wrote? —"He will be fortunate, indeed, if he escapes the censure of those who are in authority above him, for the abuse of the influence which his official station gives him."

Did he not assail the Catholic Church when he called upon the Protestants to persecute the religion if it was found that Mr. Van Buren got a majority of votes in any place where Catholics were numerous? Did "the eminent Catholic clergymen" of Baltimore consider this to be merely "a censure upon Bishop England," and not an attack upon their religion, and upon the Catholic freedom of suffrage?

Thus, it is plain that the Bishop's whole crime consisted in writing what he authorizes us to say he still thinks, that whatever real evils have fallen upon the country are derived from other sources, and not from the administration of Mr. Van Buren. And though since General Greene's assault, the Bishop thinks proper to use the right, which he will not forego, of expressing his preference, he defies any one to show that he has by any way whatever sought to influence any one under his spiritual charge to vote one way or the other, though his advice has been asked by many.

General Green has vented all his rage against the Catholics, because of his greater affection for them. Why can he not spare a little for a large number of the clergymen of various Protestant denominations who are praying and preaching for the opposed candidates? We could give him at least fifty from various sections of Georgia, and the larger number are eloquent for his own party? He need not come South. His co-labourer in Philadelphia can probably favour him with the name of the subject of the following article from the *United States Gazette*, September 25:

AWFUL TREATMENT OF A CLERGYMAN

"With such a heading, or caption, for it is very taking, we met a paragraph in the papers, which we thought would rouse the indignation of the press. 'Pulling a clergyman's nose, and kicking him from the pulpit,' is worse than sacrilege,—and what is more, the clergyman was a Van Buren man. We were shocked to think that any Whig should be guilty of such an outrage, and felt determined to denounce the perpetrator of such an act. How like a demon he must have appeared, thought we, winding his way up the crooked stairs of the pulpit, and laying violent hands and

feet on a minister of the Gospel in the very midst of his ministerial labours, 'in the sober use of his legitimate, peculiar powers.' We read the paragraph more carefully and found that a clergyman had been preaching and praying party politics in his pulpit, and some indiscreet young man had said that he 'ought to have his nose pulled and be kicked from the pulpit.' He was wrong, nevertheless—there is nothing canonical in such gross applications—the scourge of small cords (of public opinion), should be applied to him who would make his ministry of peace a means of social war, and change the place of prayer to a den of party strife.''

The next is a little specimen from Georgia. The *Savannah Telegraph*, of September 15, informs us of a large Harrison meeting in Scriven County, at which the Van Buren men assisted.

''The company having assembled at the court-house, under an arbour,

''On motion of Col. A. S. Jones, the Rev. Peyton L. Wade was called to the chair, the Democrats not voting.

''The chair announced the order of the day, viz.: Col. Gamble was to open, followed by Col. Lawson, Democrat, without being limited as to time,—other speakers would be timed.

''Col. Thos. Green moved that the Rev. Moses N. McCall be associated with the Rev. Peyton L. Wade in the chair, and to which motion the chair objected, on the ground that the motion was out of order, as 'the meeting was a Harrison meeting.' ''

It is not want of materials that prevents our furnishing the General as abundantly as he could desire.

Now, here is direct clerical influence openly used by Protestant clergymen, and is there nothing of censure but for the Pope's inquisitor? This is the impartiality of our press.

It is of this, and not of supporting General Harrison, that we complain.

One word now for the influence of Bishop England, the ''Catholic champion,'' the ''grand inquisitor,'' and for the prospect of his carrying the vote of the Catholics as a body.

The council which the General praises so much, says, and the General prints it,

''And here, beloved brethren, whilst we disclaim all right to interfere with your judgment in the political affairs of our common country, and are far from entertaining the wish to control you in the constitutional exercise of your freedom—we cannot in justice to ourselves, refrain from addressing to you a few observations, equally demanded by the love that we bear to our civil and political institutions, and the obligations of morality. You cannot but be aware that our own views and sentiments, respecting the political parties which divide our national councils, are as little in harmony as your own, as those of any other religious body in our land.''

Will General Green charge the prelates with the publication of a lie? Is not this, then, plain evidence that there was as little chance of getting a consolidated Catholic vote as of getting a consolidated Protestant vote?

Bishop England subscribed this declaration. How, then, could he

expect a consolidated Catholic vote, even if he desired it? Would the bishops whose preferences differed from his, allow him such domination?

But Bishop England's influence is paramount. The *Pilot*, of September 7th, says:

"Bishop England's declaration of preference for the administration, becomes an exhortation and a solemn religious injunction from one who, if he is not the first in the church, cannot be called even the second in spiritual influence. He is known throughout the United States as the great champion of Catholicism; and it might well be supposed that such a letter, coming from such a source, would have an undue influence upon the consciences of all those who have been accustomed to look up to him as the great expounder of religious obligations."

Does General Green mean to say that the other bishops regard the Bishop of Charleston as one whom they must follow?

Did the Bishop's declaration of preference (which, by the by, he had not made in that letter) influence "the intelligent Catholics of Baltimore and their eminent clergymen?" General Green says they adhere to him. We can have no objection. The *Frederick City Examiner*, of September 9th, a Harrison paper, forms, we think, a more just estimate than General Green does. That paper could not discern either electioneering in the letter, or influence in the Bishop.

BISHOP ENGLAND.

"This eminent divine, having recently written a letter declining an invitation to a public dinner, given by the friends of the administration to Mr. Colquitt, of Georgia, on the express ground of a determination not to take any part in political matters, the Van Buren party have foisted his letter into the public prints, and are circulating it in the form of handbills. What their immediate object can be, in doing this, it is hard to guess. The Bishop manifests a strong disinclination to be brought into the arena of politics, from a just belief that it would impair his ministry 'of peace and conciliation;' and, although, in a portion of the letter there is a sentence which would seem to exonerate the administration, in the opinion of the writer, from the responsibility for the 'distress in our states,' it is yet expressed in very vague terms, and must be set down as one of those sweeping generalities which writers will sometimes indulge in, when their productions are not intended for the public eye, as, we think, was manifestly the case in this instance. But suppose we admit that the Bishop, being located in the heart of South Carolina, is tinctured with Van Burenism. What can be made of it? Do the party suppose, for a moment, that the members of his church are to be influenced in their politics by his position or preferences? If they do, it is a great mistake. If the truth were known, we think it highly probable that the Bishop is, even among the ministers of his own church, largely in the minority, in regard to his political preferences. We believe that three-fourths of the clergymen of all denominations would be in favour of Harrison, if they took part in politics; and we are more fully convinced that, in the present canvass, the opinion of any minister in the country, as such, would have no more effect upon the politics of the people than upon a hail-storm.

"The people of this country are jealous of clerical interference with their political opinions, and hence it is that clergymen generally, have found it most expedient to abstain from any active participation in the business of politics. Such was doubtless the spirit under which Bishop England wrote the letter in question, declining to take part in a public festival, and he will be much surprised to find that the administration party have dragged his name into the canvass to make political capital out of it."

As far as we can learn, the *Examiner* has, so far as respects the clergy in his vicinity, and certainly, so far as regards the Bishop's own letter, given quite a correct view of the subject.

We said that General Green insulted the Catholic clergy. We proceed to the proof.

It is an insult to any man to invite him to do what you say does not become him, and to urge him to its performance by threats.

General Green says that it would be unbecoming in the Catholic clergy to influence their flocks to vote, at the present election, for one candidate in preference to the other.

General Green invites the Catholic clergy, his own eminent friends included, to influence their flocks to vote against Mr. Van Buren.

"We are aware that, with a large body of the Catholic clergy, the propagation of their religion, and what they believe to be the true faith is of much more vital importance, than whether Mr. Van Buren or General Harrison is President. And we do not hesitate to avow, that we expect that a just regard for their higher obligations, as servants of a Master whose kingdom is not of this world, will prompt them to exert their influence to counteract Bishop England's misguided political zeal. The only way that they can counteract it, is to disabuse the laity, over whom his letter might have an influence in relation to the political question, and its bearing upon them as a society. We, therefore, believe that Bishop England's letter will have a political effect precisely the opposite of that intended. The clergy cannot but see, that if they rally for Mr. Van Buren, politically, it will rally the Protestants against them—against their schools and their church. We do not believe that Bishop England is prepared for this."

Such is the way in which General Green compliments his eminent clerical friends: "Come, gentlemen, Bishop England never canvassed any one, but I beg of you to degrade yourselves by getting votes for General Harrison; and if you do not, your church will be ruined."

"If you permit in any place where you are, from any cause whatsoever, a majority to be given for Mr. Van Buren, we shall rouse the Protestants to destroy your church, and I shall take my children from your schools."

General Green must look upon his eminent Catholic friends to be a more pitiable set than we know them to be.

SECTION V

The subject grows upon us, and each post brings us new proof of the correctness of our observation, that no other religious body in the United States is treated with more insolence than the Catholic body is; not only by that discreditable aggregate which assumes the title of the religious press, but by the political press and the political agitators of the land. How has General Green proclaimed a war of extermination against the Catholics? How has he denounced and insulted Bishop England, and misrepresented him? How has he insulted the Catholic clergy, by threatening them with ruin to the religion, and the taking of his children from their school, unless they would canvass and procure Catholic votes for General Harrison? And all this, because Bishop England merely gave an opinion that the present administration did not deluge the country with innumerable evils, real and imaginary. How nobly has the General declared, that if any Protestant clergyman was to be guilty of such a high crime, no mercy should be shown to him!!

In our last, we have shown to the General some Protestant clergymen, praying and preaching and presiding at county meetings for his friend General Harrison, and lo! we find on his part neither blustering nor threats! How is this? It is as we stated: because the insolence of custom has habituated one party to heap abuse, and made the other believe it was his duty to crouch. And shall it continue? We trust it shall not.

We have now before us a pretty specimen. We regret that our limits will not allow us to insert the entire document of friend Michael H. Barton, who has more influence amongst the Quakers than Bishop England had or has, or ever will have, amongst the Catholics. It is quoted by the *New York Evening Express*, a Harrison paper of September 29th, from the *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, and we also find it on the columns of the *Philadelphia National Gazette* of October 3d, not reprobated as an avowed open appeal to the religious body to which friend Barton belongs, to vote, as a body, against Mr. Van Buren, and for General Harrison, but lauded in the following words and figures, to wit:

"Our fellow-citizens of the Society of Friends, who are numerous among our readers, will find an appeal in another column, made by one of their number in favour of General Harrison. It is evidently the plain statement of a plain man, who has

sought for truth at the fountain-head, and narrates his own experience and observations. Reasoning has been abandoned by the President's advocates, and their occupation is to defame the Whig party generally, and its candidate in particular. It becomes therefore necessary to rebut their calumnies, which it is a national shame to own, are not without influence, where ignorance and prejudice have prepared the way."

The document is *An Address to the Society of Friends throughout the United States, and especially to the Voting Members of said Society.*

He commenced by stating, that he visited General Harrison to learn his sentiments: that formerly he had some "conscientious scruples on the propriety of Christians actively participating in political governments."

These scuples have however, been overcome, and he prefers Harrison to Van Buren. He then says:

"Christians of the United States now doubtless hold the balance of power between the two great political parties of the nation; and hence, if they would exercise it in reference to Christian principle and public good, they might henceforward secure the services of the best men that the two political parties may present for their suffrage."

What he means by "Christians," we need not discuss. It is intelligible. The object is to get the "Christian" vote as a whole; no splitting. He then proceeds to remark, that "unfortunately" "the political abolitionists are, as yet, a minority," and he is against having a "third political organization."

"Correct public sentiment, by truth, love, and persuasion, and correct legislation will inevitably follow; but for the minority to suppose, that under any possible circumstances, it might be right to coerce the acts of the majority in a republican government, is to suppose that an effect may exceed the cause.

"In coming to a conclusion relative to the claims of candidates for our suffrage, if upon one important topic they appear to be equally balanced, then we should weigh them upon other topics of the most importance. Friends' sentiments upon the important topic of slavery are generally known, that, while they deprecate it as a great moral and political evil, they also disapprove all unconstitutional or coercive measures. To inflame the passions, is but to close the mind against the appeals of truth. Admitting that Harrison and Van Buren stand nearly upon a par in relation to slavery, still there are other important topics upon which they may be weighed."

The next topic introduced is, "doing justice to the Indians," whose removal he considers to be great and cruel injustice. General Harrison satisfied him of the excellence of his dispositions, and the correctness of his views regarding the Indians. Mr. Van Buren ratified a treaty with the Seneca Indians, which treaty was approved of only by the casting vote in the Senate; and by this treaty, the lands of these Indians are to be given up in three years, and, to add to the criminality of Mr. Van Buren, it is supposed that one of his sons is a member of a company

that purchased these lands: though a majority of the Indians are said to have refused to ratify the treaty. He then sums up in the following words:

"To me, it seems as though every senator, as well as the Vice-President and President, in sanctioning that treaty, endorsed all the bribery, treachery, and wickedness of its origin: and therefore for me to support either of them for a public office, without knowing that they had repented of and confessed this public sin, would render me a participator of the same.

"The time has come, in my opinion, for Christians to hold public men responsible for their public sins, and to have no fellowship with them, but rather reprove them by voting against them. Unless this course is pursued, and Christian principle and influence are brought to bear upon public men, our country, I fear, is destined to destruction! Under a fearful and weighty apprehension of this kind, I invite the friends of liberty and justice to throw their influence across the paths of political gamblers.

"The policy of the administration of our government is, that the Indians shall go west of the Mississippi. The prosecution of this policy by foul means has already produced the Black Hawk and Florida wars, and expended perhaps fifty millions of money, with the destruction of two thousand lives; and the result of a forcible removal of the New York Indians, I have no doubt, would be a general Indian war upon our western frontiers. One of the heads of the Seneca nation said to me: 'If the whites are determined to have our lands, let them come and tomahawk us, and bury us by our fathers, and not thus meanly drive us from our homes.'

"Believing that the election of General Harrison will result in the annulling of this fraudulent treaty, and in ending the disgraceful and expensive Florida war, if there was no cause of preference in him, save this prospect, I should esteem his election of vast importance; and knowing that some friends in New York state are fearful, in consequence of the reiterated false statements of one class of newspapers, that Harrison is not capable of filling the presidential chair, by reason of age and lack of talent, I do hereby testify, that it is the unanimous testimony of the members of the Society of Friends, in this city and vicinity, who are personally acquainted with General Harrison, that he is, in all respects, in their opinion, well qualified to fulfil the station of President of the United States; and all that I have conversed with say he shall have their support for the same.

"Michael H. Barton.

"Cincinnati, 9th month 17th, 1840."

Now had Bishop England invited the Catholics as a body, to vote for Mr. Van Buren, as friend Barton has invited "Christians" to bring "Christian principles and influence" to bear against Mr. Van Buren, and for General Harrison: had he assigned as the cause for this, the principles of abolitionism, and to sustain it, charged the cruelty to Indians, and the criminality of robbing them, and of removing them, as the grounds of his invitation, what a field would he have afforded for General Duff Green? And how nobly would the gallant General bestride his war-horse, and rush upon the miserable Catholic imported paupers? But what is said of Michael H. Barton? Not a word. The Quakers are

wealthy, they are prudent, they act in a body, they have good memories, they have perseverance. General Green and the other Generals of the press know this. What now has become of the vapouring of the man who sends his boys to the priests, and his girls to the nuns? We have not been treated with impartiality, nor do we expect to experience it for years: but we shall endeavour to hasten the day of its arrival.

General Green said in his article of September third:—

"Until the result of the Illinois elections, and this letter of Bishop England, we had seen nothing in the progress of the canvass to justify a belief that any attempt to bring the Catholics as a body to vote for Mr. Van Buren, would receive the countenance of the Catholic clergy, or of any distinguished member of that body."

This is a distinct charge that the result in Illinois was produced by Catholic votes, procured through clerical efforts, to influence the members of our church to vote for Mr. Van Buren, as a body.

What evidence sustains this allegation? In the same article, the General says, "We cannot close our eyes to the fact, that Mr. Van Buren is in a condition to make any sacrifice to secure his re-election, and that his partisans in Illinois have obtained this foreign Catholic aid by an appeal to the passions and prejudices of men," and so forth.

This is but a repetition of the charge: it contains no proof.

The article of the 7th, has not a syllable about Illinois.

On the 19th, the General fulfils his promise to speak of . . . the late election in Illinois, and "the attempt to carry our local elections by the aid of *foreigners.*"

Why! the charge was not that the election was carried by *foreigners*, it was by *foreign Catholic aid*, and the General italicised the word *Catholic* as well as the word *foreign*, not foreigners.

Thus by a miserable manœuvre to change terms, the General attempts to escape from the position which he had so rashly assumed. We shall not follow him off the ground; we are Catholics, the charge was made upon Catholics, and he shall be kept to the word until he sickens of it, as he ought. He calls upon the native born citizens to show their indignation, and he refers them to the *Lynchburgh Virginian.*

Who is that! a newspaper—and what does this newspaper testify? That "the Illinois papers assert in the most unqualified terms, that the elections were carried by the votes of foreigners upon the canals." Assertion is no proof, and even if it was, the Illinois papers are not stated to assert that these foreigners were Catholics.

The *Charlotteville Advocate* tells of a friend—who is he?—who will not vote for Harrison, but denounces Van Buren, though that nameless friend is an administration man, and why? Because other friends of

the administration distributed 450 Irish labourers in different counties to vote. Well, suppose they did—where is the proof that these Irish labourers were not citizens? Where the proof that they were Catholics? Where the proof that they voted under clerical influence? Call you this assertion of a report proof? Is it for this that the Catholics are to be exterminated, and that Bishop England is to be insulted, and the eminent Catholic clergy of Baltimore are to be cajoled to canvass for Harrison, and that Michael H. Barton is to be praised, and the Quakers are to go in a body for abolition and Harrison? Has General Green no better leg than this to sustain him?

Yes, for the same paper tells us that 2000 Germans, lately settled in Illinois, voted for the Van Buren people. Well, were these Germans Catholics? Deponent saith not: but it is to be presumed they are, because one-half of the German labourers who come hither are Protestants, and the greater portion of those lately arrived in Illinois and Missouri, are Lutherans, whom the tyranny of the late king of Prussia forced from the homes of their infancy, because they would not become evangelical!

But the Catholic clergy, or at least some distinguished member of their body, procured that those "foreign imported Catholic paupers, sent hither by the monarchs of Catholic Europe, to destroy our splendid institutions, and to undermine our liberties," should vote for the Van Buren people. Where is the proof of this?

O! there is abundant proof! The *Charlotteville Advocate* says, (and the *Charlotteville Advocate* is infallible,) that its friend says, that the 2000 Germans, of whose religion he says nothing, "were induced to vote the Van Buren ticket, by being told that in the event of General Harrison's election to the presidency, every German in the country would be reshipped to Germany, or reduced to the condition of a slave in the country." Well, General, what has the Pope, or Bishop England, or the Catholic religion to do with this? It would be just as good logic to have charged your own eminent Catholic clerical friends, whom you are so tolerant as to entrust with the care of setting the Potomac on fire, or burning the Boston Convent, as to say that the Catholics ought to be exterminated, for the majority in Illinois, not having the fear of General Green, and of bigotry before their eyes, were guilty of having voted for the friends of Mr. Van Buren.

We have frequently seen partisan editors in pitiable conditions, but we have never seen a more miserable plight than that in which our poor General is here merged. He has endeavoured to shift his ground, because he found his charge not to be sustained; but it will not do. His

eminent Catholic clerical friends must pity him; they will not persecute him, for we doubt not they have abundant charity to forgive the fruitless effort of their political associate, as he calls himself, of the patron of their schools, as he proclaims himself to be,—an effort to rouse Protestant hostility against our common church, by the statement of notorious untruths; but still, though their charity would cover the multitude of sins, the position of the General is not so enviable. He has made charges against the Catholics, without a particle of truth, or the semblance of proof; he has endeavoured to escape by shifting his position, and his effort was a miserable failure. He has assailed the Catholics, and he says, that he is sustained by the most eminent clergy. He has insulted one of their prelates, whom he calls their champion, but who disclaims the honour, as he disregards the insolence. The General says, that he is abetted in the insult by the most estimable of those whose champion this Bishop is said to be, and we are authorized to inform him that the prelate whom he misrepresents, is perfectly satisfied that his assailant and they who abet him, and approve of his course, may enjoy the full honours of their victory, and be equally successful in every similar assault.

We have not, however, as yet, done with Illinois.

The official return we understand to be 43,572 for the administration, and against it 37,536, leaving a majority of 6,036 for the administration. Now supposing 2,000 bad German votes, and 450 bad Irish votes, still it would leave the administration a majority of 3,586, when they are deducted. Suppose then, the friends of General Harrison procured the 2,450 bad votes, and made them good, which of course would be, if cast for Michael H. Barton and the Indians, it would still leave the administration a majority of 1,136 votes. For peace sake, then, if we had the power, we would deprive Van Buren of those ugly Germans, and those vulgar Irish, and give them to General Harrison, of what use would they be to him? Would it save Illinois? Why, then, should General Green be so angry, and write such notorious untruths? Our answer is, "because he thought that with the countenance of his eminent and intelligent Catholic friends, he could treat the imported paupers as he pleased. Will the Catholics allow this sort of warfare? Why shall they be treated in a different manner from that in which their fellow-citizens of other religions and of no religion are treated? We repeat, it is their own fault if they allow it. Let them resist it as they ought; let them cause those who attempt to class them in politics, or in civil life, as a separate body in the republic, to feel that it is an insult to which they will not submit. Neither Bishop England, nor any other

member of their body ever made the effort to band them as a separate class, as friend Barton bands the Quakers, for any political effect. We recollect, in the days of nullification, that Bishop England was on the side of the Union party, and openly, but quietly declared it; at least five-sixths of the Catholics of Charleston were nullifiers; the priests whom he most respected, went with him to the ballot-box, and voted the ticket opposed to his: they officiated at the same altar, they preserved peace and good feeling and affectionate intercourse amongst the Catholics, whilst each felt that he was free to vote as his own judgment directed him. The Catholics of this city, know their own political rights too well to receive the dictation of any clergyman, or of any layman; they know well how to preserve unity of faith, religious subordination, political freedom of opinion and action, and republican independence, with becoming respect for those with whom they differ. Whilst they assert the right of using their own freedom, they feel that they have no right to make slaves of their clergy or to disfranchise them; that right which each vindicates for himself he concedes to his bishop, to think and to speak, and to act with becoming independence as a citizen.

We are quite aware that Bishop England had no intention of publishing his preference, upon the present occasion, but the moment that General Green raised the question, the bishop thought that he owed it to himself, and to his order, to use that right which it was sought to paralyse.

It is true, that the greater number of the Catholics of Charleston, are what General Green calls foreign imported Catholic paupers, ignorant of our institutions. Yet they appear to us to know the spirit of our constitution, and to reduce it to practice, better than does General Green.

SECTION VI

Before we proceed to the topic of which we intend treating this day, we shall exhibit a little more of General Green's conduct towards Catholics.

Our readers will recollect that Bishop England has not to this moment either asked for a vote for Mr. Van Buren nor against General Harrison: nor has he recommended to any citizen, whether Catholic or not, to vote in any manner that was not the result of his own calm reflection, guided by a desire to serve our republics, and with a single eye, as he would answer to God for his vote, to the good of the country. The Bishop had not expressed his own preference for Mr. Van Buren until after he had been insulted by General Green.

At this stage, General Green declared that he would reprove any Protestant clergyman who should be guilty of a similar crime. We have shown to him, and to the public, that very many Protestant clergymen prayed and preached chiefly for General Harrison, a few for Mr. Van Buren; we have shown a Protestant clergyman presiding at a country meeting for General Harrison, and others attending thereat quite ready to take the chair if permitted:—we have shown one of the leading ministers of the Society of Friends, publishing a political document to induce all Christians to band themselves against Van Buren, and this same minister calling upon them to support General Harrison, upon the principle that he was rather a better abolitionist than Van Buren and quite disposed to do justice to the Indians—and a number of the papers of General Green's party laud and magnify this minister for thus calling upon all who have Christian principles, to give a consolidated Christian vote. And yet General Green does not rebuke one of those ministers, nor lecture any of his brethren who praise this man for really doing what General Green falsely charged upon Bishop England, and upon the pretence of which charge, the General insulted the Bishop and threatened to have the Catholics exterminated.

Again, General Green declared, that though he sent his children to Catholic schools, yet he would call upon all Protestants, and all good men, to resist Catholics, to put them down, and to get the country rid of their religion, if it should be discovered that they were generally voting, as a body, for any candidate. Yet he calls upon them to prove that they will not vote as a body for Mr. Van Buren, by voting as a body for General Harrison!

He, in his paper of October the 10th, copies with approbation a letter which appeared in the *National Intelligencer*, purporting to be from somebody who says that he is "by birth, education, and profession, a Roman Catholic." And this letter, after some very proper remarks, quite in unison with our own sentiments, concludes in the following words:—

"To my fellow-Catholics I would say, ponder on this letter of the secretary well —it is by far the most alarming attempt that has ever yet occurred to point at us 'the finger of suspicion,' and to make us hereafter disfranchised, though citizens, and obnoxious as foreign spies, though we may be the truest patriots. Arise in your strength, and answer the partisan appeal heretofore made to you by the friends of Mr. Van Buren, but answer it with disdain and contempt. Tell the minions of power who have sought to enlist your religious prejudices, that you can never, as Catholics, support a President whose first secretary and confidential friend has perpetrated so gross an outrage on your patriotism as this to which I have alluded. If you re-elect Mr. Van Buren, you confirm this secretary in his high office, and wo unto the Catholics

who shall hereafter ask office or favour from a party which boasts as one of its leaders the Hon. John Forsyth, of Georgia, Mr. Van Buren's approved Secretary of State."

Here, then, the General praises even a Catholic, who calls upon Catholics, as a body, to vote for a particular candidate—and Bishop England, who did nothing like this, is the great object of the General's ire and indignation. General Green called upon the Catholics to vote as a body against Mr. Van Buren, because in his letter to Mr. Cicognani, when Secretary of State, he wrote respectfully of the Pope, and General Green recommends to the Catholics the advice of a writer who calls upon them to vote against Mr. Van Buren, because his Secretary of State writes of the Pope indecorously!

General Green declared that if the Catholics exhibited any symptom of voting, as a body, they ought to be exterminated. General Green and his associates say nothing of exterminating the Quakers and other Christians, should they follow the advice of Friend Barton, by voting in a body; but they copy his letter recommending it, and some of them print it, especially in Philadelphia, a second time, because of its excellence, and look upon it to be calculated to promote the election of General Harrison.

General Green expatiated upon the impropriety of clergymen taking any active part in elections, and held up Bishop England, who took no active part in the present contest, as an object of execration. He declared that if any Protestant clergyman did take such a part, he would treat him in like manner. We shall furnish him with a name in addition to the references that we previously made, and of which he took no notice, as we knew he would not. The *Raleigh Register*, of October 9th, a good staunch Whig paper, describing a grand Harrison convention, held in that city.

"The farmer, the mechanic, the artist, the professional man, the divine, and, more striking than all, the gallant tar, had each left his vocation, to join in the noble, the invincible determination to rescue the country from the band of peculators and tyrants, who for years have been preying upon the vitals of the constitution."

And again—

"This we can say, that there was no Whig present who did not resolve to redouble his energies in the contest which is ahead, and which must determine the great question whether we are to live slaves or freemen."

In a subsequent column, describing the succession of orators that stood forth at the call of the committee—

"The Rev. Mr. Crudup, of Granville, was next called on and addressed the convention for about half an hour, but we were not fortunate enough to hear him."

This was a State convention, and the scene of great excitement. The editor says:

"The farmer forgot his toils—the labourer his work—even the women abandoned their household duties—and all, actuated by one common impulse, rushed to the road side, to give one hearty 'Hurrah for Old Tip,' and to bid the delegates 'God speed' in their good work."

Now, what would General Green write if the name of the Inquisitor-General of the United States stood where that of the Reverend Mr. Crudup, of Granville, does? Which is more like electioneering, to write to a committee an opinion that all the real and imaginary evil which is said to exist, was not produced by those whom the American people placed in office, or to address the Convention of a state in popular assembly, in support of the claims of one of the candidates, as Reverend Mr. Crudup did; whilst the Haytian legate merely recommended that all citizens should cherish mutually kind feeling towards each other, and that each should in his conscience and before God, examine who would be the most useful to the Union, and should vote independently for him?

The conclusion we draw is, that it was so much a matter of course to have the Catholics abused on all occasions, and their clergy vilified and insulted, that General Green, like the old woman who had been skinning living eels during forty years, and been accustomed to see them writhe under her infliction, was quite astonished at being told that such conduct was cruel! "Old woman, why would you be so cruel as to torture the eels after that fashion?"

"Poh! poh!—they are accustomed to it now, I have been doing it during the last forty years!"

"General, why do you treat the Catholics with more insolence than you would dare to treat Quakers, or Methodists, or Baptists, or any other religious body?"

"Poh! poh!—they have always been abused, every paper in the Union vilifies them, I send my children to their schools, Bishop England is an inquisitor, he is fair game, because he forms a different opinion of the administration from that which I advocate, and we must punish him for expressing it. We must also terrify the other bishops and priests with the prospects of persecution unless they get their flocks to vote for Harrison. And the intelligent Catholics who have been in the habit of taking with edifying resignation every insult they receive, and the eminent clergymen upon whose fears I have calculated, tell me, that they are quite satisfied that I should whip the inquisitor to my heart's content."

We now ask our readers, whether, putting Van Buren and Harrison out of the question, they will succumb to this? We have selected General Green, not because he is the only, or the greatest offender, but

because he has just at the moment thrust himself in our way, and is a fair specimen of an immense portion of the American press.

How long will the Catholic body continue to uphold, and in many instances to applaud those who flatter, or cajole, or insult them, or denounce them, as it may suit their interest or their caprice?

We desire to see the Catholics as a religious body upon the ground of equality with all other religious societies. We desire as citizens, to see them merged in the bulk of their fellow-citizens, and we consider that man who would call upon them to stand aloof from their brethren, in the politics of the country, as neither a friend to America nor a friend to Catholics. To this there is, we believe, one fair exception. If any candidate for public office, or his supporters, shall single them out from their fellow-citizens as objects for insult or for inquiry, we cannot in such a case look upon it as a dereliction of duty to the republic on their part, to prefer a capable friend to a capable enemy.

We have been gratified with the conduct of our brethren in the faith, at our elections, where they have fallen under our observation. We have never known them ambitious of putting forward candidates from their own body for public offices, and when, as it seldom happened, a Catholic was before the electors, so far as we could discover, he did not from his coreligionists get a vote, because of his church-fellowship. We must, however, say, that it is our opinion that on more occasions than one, we knew that when men wantonly assailed or insulted the Catholics, as a body, they felt its consequences at the ballot-box. This we look upon to be lawful, but any other combination we would consider criminal. We also believe, that many others would unite with Catholics in punishing in such a way the man who would be guilty of such an insult.

We repeat then our maxim—"Let Catholics, in religion stand isolated as a body, and, upon as good ground as their brethren. Let Catholics, as citizens and politicians, not be distinguishable from their other brethren of the commonmealth."

We shall add—"Let them make him who would so distinguish them, feel that he must not repeat the insult to them, nor the injustice to the republic."

SECTION VII

Danger to the republic: General Duff Green is about to edit a paper to prove the danger arising to our liberties from the existence of Popery, as he is now pleased to call the religion of his friends, the

"eminent Catholic clergy" of Baltimore, and the "enlightened Catholics of Maryland." The great object in view is to prevent foreign pauper Catholics being in future imported, or if imported to prevent their becoming citizens, to keep them in the condition of white slaves, a degraded caste of Helots in our republic. The danger of permitting them to have the right of voting, arises from the slavish notions which they have on the subject of the divine right of kings, emperors, *et hoc genus omne*. The General is but the organ of that party, in whose employment he is at present.

We may as well here insert his letter in reply to an invitation from Detroit, which we find on several papers:—

"CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 17, 1840.

"*Gentlemen*:—I was yesterday honoured with your invitation of August 26, to meet the Vice-President of the United States, on the 28th instant, at Detroit.

"The compliment which you pay him is one of those political movements from which I have kept aloof, though I am free to confess my opinion is, that the administration of which he forms so conspicuous a part, has acted for the benefit of our Union, and does not deserve the vituperation with which it is assailed.

"It may perhaps tend to show the spirit of some of its opponents, when so humble an individual as I am, and for so many years a citizen, though I must confess to the crime of having been born in a distant land, and of having voluntarily come hither, dare not express this simple opinion without being denounced in unmeasured terms, and the persons whose religion I teach threatened with extermination if it be discovered that from any cause there shall be found a majority in favour of Mr. Van Buren, in any district where Catholics are numerous.

"I have suffered insult and oppression under the penal code against my religion in Ireland, and I came hither flattering myself with the expectation that there existed at least freedom of thought, and liberty for any citizen to express his opinion that the public officers of the Union were not guilty of that mal-administration which was imputed to them by their competitors. I have more than once been convinced of my mistake; and if my religion and its professors are to be made the victims of my imagining that in our republic, Catholics, like other citizens, had liberty of political opinion, expression, and action, I would far prefer being again in my former position; for the Orangeism of Ireland is mercy compared to the insolence of those who here insult us by their expressions of kindness and condescension, whilst they threaten us with extermination, unless we stoop to be their slaves.

"I am aware, gentlemen, that they who are thus disposed in our regard, do not form the American people, but I know that they are numerous and active, and I should regret for the sake of our republican institutions, that they had the power to work their will. They would indeed begin with the Catholics, but others would soon feel the effects of their success.

"I take the liberty of sending you a couple of papers which will show the occasion of my remarks. "I have the honour to be, gentlemen,

"With great respect,

"Your obedient, humble servant,

"JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

SECTION VIII

General Green: As we shall have something better to occupy our columns for a few weeks, we shall take our leave of the General, for the present, and perhaps for ever, in a few remarks.

In his paper, of the 24th instant, he ascribes our editorial articles to Bishop England. In this he may, or he may not be correct; but we wish to repeat what we have often previously published. 1. The *Miscellany* is edited by several persons, of whom Bishop England is one. 2. During more than half the year, and often even when he is in this city, Bishop England does not know the contents of the publication until after it is in print, frequently not for a week after its publication. 3. There is an understanding between the editors, that, unless with common consent, neither shall, for himself, avow or disavow any editorial article. 4. That each shall consider himself, until such avowal is made, responsible for every article.

Thus, it matters not who is the writer, though General Green cannot know who it is, he is at liberty to ascribe our articles to the Bishop if he so pleases.

He, in the paper of the 24th, charges us with "unfairly," "uncandidly," and "*Jesuitically*" attributing to him assaults upon the Catholics at large, when he only stated that Miss Maria Monk's patron, W. C. Brownlee, D.D., and others, made the charges. In the very quotation made by the General, he prints our words "We again adduce General Green *as a witness.*" Thus it was exactly placing him in the position which he says is correctly his own. We had, in the same article, (September 26,) previously stated, "General Green thus acknowledges what we believe few persons who know the country will attempt to deny, that throughout the United States, there is a deep and abiding prejudice against our religion." We had extracted his own words to show this acknowledgement, and we inserted previously at full length, upon our columns, his entire article. How, then, were we uncandid? We gave the entire evidence; if our conclusion was incorrect, it was in the power of our readers to correct it.

We also said, "The charge has been made, during years, in a variety of ways, by the sectarian papers." And we gave a number of quotations from those papers. We also wrote, "This is a serious charge, not made by the editor of the *Baltimore Pilot*, but testified by him as existing."

After giving the quotations, we wrote, "we admit that the General gives a very fair representation of the unfounded assertions of the

prejudiced accusers." We now leave to the General to settle with the Jesuits, who, we are told, perhaps without good ground, are friends of the General and opponents of Van Buren; and who, for aught that we know, have the honour of educating his sons, the insult which he has given them in his italics. We, indeed, respect and admire their venerable society, but neither of us has the honour of being a member thereof.

Now we avow, that we did write also, "we have no recollection of any charge being made upon either the Catholics of Europe or those of the United States, that they expended money in sending or bringing hither a Catholic population." And the General wrote, amongst the allegations, on the 3d of September, "that the money expended in getting up schools, as well as that used in sending a pauper and other Catholic population to this country." At the period that we wrote, we had not seen this charge, made, as far as we could recollect, and we, therefore, held the General, who made the statement, responsible therefor, until he should produce his authority.

The General, of course, if he could adduce the proof that the charge of thus using the money was made, would have shown that either our information was imperfect, or our memory was bad. He now comes forward to vindicate himself, by showing that the charge was made, and, of course, adduces all the evidence which he possessed when he wrote the statement, and all that he might have since obtained, and it amounts just to this:—

"As to the question of fact between Bishop England and ourselves, we quote the following from a work, entitled *Popery an Enemy to Civil and Religious Liberty, and dangerous to our Republic*: by W. C. Brownlee, D. D., of the Collegiate Protestant Reformed Dutch Church, New York. Fourth edition, page 218."

"But (says Dr. Brownlee) we have most abundant evidence that these foreign conspirators are doing as much mischief by the material of mobs and pauperism, thrown upon our shores, in one continuous stream of turbulence and crime, as by their colleges and seminaries."

And the same writer says, on page 203:

"Bishop England, in a circular published in Ireland, shows that 'there is an organized system of means in operation to throw in upon us immense bodies of Popish emigrants.'"

"Will any one, after reading these extracts, say that the Bishop has not done us great injustice by charging that, in referring to these publications, 'we had offered a gross insult to the great body of the Catholics of the United States.' Have we not fully proved everything that we said, and is not Bishop England convicted of want of candour, to say the least."

Now, the charge was that money was expended, either by the Catholics of Europe or of America, in bringing hither a pauper Catholic population. And even Doctor Brownlee makes no such charge. Though

every statement that the Doctor makes in the above extracts, is as false as any that was ever made by his *protegé*, Miss Maria Monk.

The General, finding this ground not very solid, falls back upon one more tenable, as he supposes, and upon which he is not very likely to be disturbed.

He charges Bishop England with being the agent of the Austrian government.

"In the next place, the public do not know that Bishop England is the agent of the Austrian government, and that the purpose of his attack on this press was to prevent the proof of that fact. We deem it to be our duty to prove it on him. We have quoted his own language, admitting it."

Now, the proof which the General gives, that the Bishop himself admits the fact, is the following:

"But we will not let the matter rest here. In an address put forth to his diocess at Charleston, on his return from Europe, Bishop England said:

" 'During my absence, I have not been negligent of the concerns of my diocess. I have endeavoured to interest in its behalf several eminent and dignified personages, whom I had the good fortune to meet; and have continued to impress with a conviction of the propriety of continuing their generous aid, the administration of those societies from which it has previously received valuable succour. In Paris and Lyons I have conversed with those men who manage the affairs of the Association for Propagating the Faith. This year, their grant to this diocess has been larger than usual. I have also had opportunities of communication with some of the Council which administers the Austrian Association; they continue to feel an interest in our concerns. The Propaganda in Rome, though greatly embarrassed, owing to the former plunder of its funds by rapacious infidels, has, this year, contributed to our extraordinary expenditure; as has the holy father himself, in the kindest manner, from the scanty stock which constitutes his private allowance, but which he economizes to the utmost, for the purpose of being able to devote the savings to works of piety, of charity, and of literature.

" 'The prelates of the Church of Ireland, are ready, as far as our hierarchy shall require their co-operation, to give to them their best exertions in selecting and forwarding from amongst the numerous aspirants to the sacred ministry, that are found in the island of saints (Ireland), a sufficient number of those properly qualified to supply our deficiencies. I have had very many applications, and accepted a few, who, I trust, have been judiciously selected.' "

Between the two paragraphs above quoted, there is, in the address, something which it did not suit the General to print, because it regarded the sufferings and the fidelity of Ireland. This address was delivered to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Roman Catholic Church of South Carolina, on Sunday, December 7th, 1834, and we are authorized by the Bishop to say, that though he has not the honour of holding any agency from the Emperor of Austria, he is very grateful to him for the charitable contributions received in aid of his diocess from the generous Catholics of Austria; and that since that address was delivered, he has

been fortunate enough to receive further benefactions, and hopes for still more; and that he frequently invites his flocks to pray for their benefactors, and that he shall continue so to do. As the General may wish more full and explicit declarations made by the Bishop of his conversations with the late and the present Emperor, the detail may be found more extensively given, in the address to the tenth Convention, which will be found on Vol. XIII. of the *Miscellany*, page 161.

General Green may be assured that Bishop England is quite disposed to encourage in Austria, and everywhere else that he can, that spirit which in his article of September 3d, the General thus describes and justifies.

"Where there is so much zeal and system, it would be surprising if the Catholic clergy abroad, did not avail themselves of the wide field presented to them in the fertile regions of the west, to extend what they believe to be the true faith. It is the principle upon which other Christian denominations act, and they have as much right as Protestants to erect schools, to send out missionaries, and to digest schemes of proselytism. This is their duty, and so long as the Catholic clergy believe that theirs is the true faith, they will exert themselves to extend that faith."

The General writes—

"We have said nothing against the great body of the Catholics in the United States."

That is we suppose against his "eminent clerical" friends, and his "intelligent Catholics of Baltimore." Let the General inquire who built the church of St. James in that city. Archbishop Whitfield, who was no supporter of either Andrew Jackson or of Martin Van Buren, got from the same Austrian Society a much larger sum than was given to Bishop England (the Austrian agent): he got eight thousand dollars, which were expended in building that church. Have his "eminent clerical" friends and his "intelligent Catholics of Baltimore" been thus sold to Prince Metternich? Has the General not made the charge?

The General writes—

"Does Bishop England believe that the election of Mr. Van Buren and his standing army of 200,000 men, will advance the object which Prince Metternich and his associates have in view?"

Let him ask the question in Baltimore. Let him ask the question in Ohio, in which state the aid given to Charleston would be considered a trifle in comparison with what that Harrison state has received. Let him ask it in his dear Kentucky. If the importance of the sum be the bribe for recreancy to the allegiance that we owe to our country, the Pope's inquisitor, the legate to Hayti, and the Austrian agent, is he who for the most paltry consideration has sold his conscience. General Green has drawn the distinction between American Catholics and foreign Catholics: we have not: but let him have the benefit of his distinction.

He publishes the letter of the late venerable Bishop of Cincinnati, Dr. Edward Fenwick, to the Emperor of Austria, to prove by that letter that this prelate was a ringleader in what he ventures to call a conspiracy. And who was Bishop Fenwick? A native American, the uncle to the Roman Catholic whose letter the General published with approbation on the 17th, calling upon Catholics to vote against Mr. Van Buren, because Mr. Forsythe is his Sectary of State. Bishop Fenwick was the near relative of the larger portion of the General's "intelligent Catholics of Baltimore." Thus, if there be a conspiracy, the chief conspirator then was a native, not an imported Catholic; he was from the midst of the Catholics who support the General's employers, and his letter was written fully two years before Bishop England knew of the existence of the Austrian Association.

General Green writes—

"We have acted on the presumption that American Catholics are not under Bishop England's influence, and that they are as much interested as the Protestants in ascertaining the truth of the charge made against these foreign despots."

Yet on the 7th of September, General Green wrote of the pastoral letter:

"This was the language of the assembled wisdom of the Church. It was sent forth in a spirit commanding the confidence and respect of all good Protestants as well as Catholics: and, upon reading it, it gave us pleasure to speak of the Catholics as the first to establish religious toleration in this country. But when it is coupled with Bishop England's declaration of preference for the Administration, it becomes an exhortation and a solemn religious injunction from one who, if he is not the first in the church, cannot be called even the second in spiritual influence.—He is known throughout the United States as the great champion of Catholicism; and it might well be supposed that such a letter, coming from such a source, would have an undue influence upon the conscience of all those who have been accustomed to look up to him as the great expounder of religious obligation."

This was insolently telling every Catholic in the Union that he was the slave of Bishop England, and forcing upon the pastoral letter of all the bishops, a meaning of which it was not susceptible. He thus insulted them: and he insulted them still more, by threatening them with persecution if, from any cause, Mr. Van Buren got a majority in any place where they were numerous.

He asks why Bishop England does not prove that there is no conspiracy. We answer, that he might as well undertake to prove that the Patapsco is water. He will leave General Green, and so will we, in undisturbed possession of the field over which he proposes to run his charger.

The General gives a couple of abusive extracts from an English Tory, who writes as all such unprincipled enemies of Ireland do; ac-

cording to this writer, the Irish are the vilest of the vile, and the off-scourings of society: but on the 7th of last month, according to General Green, there was an identity of sentiment between the Irish and the American Catholics:

"The Catholics of Ireland and in the United States are lovers of liberty. They are the weaker and persecuted sect: and that, although under other circumstances, they would be monarchists, in the United States they are advocates of freedom and of republican institutions, because those who oppress, are opposed to oppression."

And now, those lovers of liberty are the conspirators and the tools of the foreign despots! They are the imported pauper Catholic voters, who are to be employed to overturn our republics. And the General and his employers are to prevent the naturalization of any such, as Rufus King and his friends would prevent the naturalization, or even the immigration of the Emmets, the Sampsons, the McNevins, and other Irish rebels.

We have many more topics rising to our view, but we are done. We have placed General Duff Green now in his proper position before our readers. It is always better to have such a man in the proper point of view; an open enemy is better than a false friend. The General has in his prospectus, which will be found upon our columns, avowed his hostility.

We now leave him in his proper category. We shall treat him as we do the Brownlees, the Breckenridges, and the others of the ribald crew by which our religion is perpetually assailed. We shall take him up or fling him aside, as it suits our convenience.

We have now before us a Pittsburg paper of the 19th inst., which exhibits more of that anti-Catholic spirit which has urged General Green to make upon Bishop England his untrue charge of electioneering. The object is to profit by Protestant prejudice.

The *Pittsburg Daily American*, edited by J. W. Biddle, published on the evening of Monday, the 12th, an article which will be found below. The clergyman was in his church at vespers, at the moment when he was said to be making election speeches. The correction of the falsehood was offered to the *Pittsburg Advocate* in time for Tuesday morning's publication; that paper is also a Whig, and the imperfect correction was reluctantly admitted. Tuesday was the voting day, when the lie was to produce its effect, and that being done, all the papers were willing on Wednesday to insert the following letter:—

"*Mr. Editor*: I read with surprise and regret, an editorial in the *Pittsburgh Daily American*, of this day, the 12th of October, wherein I find my name charged as the 'immediate agent of the Pope and Van Buren,' in the words following:—

THE POPE IN THE FIELD.

"'The *loco foco* party held a political meeting yesterday on the holy Sabbath in Pandemonium, their hall of audience. The Pope's vice-gerent, priest O'Reilly, was in attendance, and addressed them—anathematized the late Whig convention; denounced the whole Whig citizens of the United States, for vile heretics, and called upon all the faithful of the true church, to come to its relief, and charged them to vote for Van Buren. We are prepared to support this with affidavits, if denied. Do you hear, you heretics? You are damned in Pandemonium, by the high priest of that hall. This O'Reilly is the immediate agent of the Pope and Van Buren.'

"Now, I hereby declare that in the whole of the above article, there is not one word of truth. I can regard it in no other light than as a vile slander from beginning to end, to disparge Catholics for political effect. I further declare that I have not this year attended a Van Buren meeting for any political purpose whatever; never so much as stood in that hall wherein I am represented as addressing the meeting, and profaning the Sabbath; never denounced, much less anathematized, the Whig convention, or any other; never stigmatized them as heretics, nor by any other disrespectful name, for I well know that many Catholics, and even Catholic priests, hold the same political principles of that body; I therefore look upon this misrepresentation as a wanton calumny, and request the honourable editors of this city, to contradict it, and all honourable men to rebuke the unworthy spirit that dictated it.

"JOHN O'REILLY,
"*Pastor of St. Paul's.*"

The object of the men who act thus is twofold. One is the indulgence of that unprincipled political ambition which is undermining the morals and the liberties of our republics; the other, a virulent hatred to Catholics and to their religion.

SECTION IX

Foreigners—Bribery: It is to us a very painful duty, but one from which we cannot, and will not flinch, to meet the wanton and unfounded insults flung upon those with whom we are intimately connected.

In the speeches lately made at Columbia, before the Senate or its committee, for the purpose of unseating Mr. Boyce, we see it stated in the papers that Governor Wilson charged the chief part of the profligacy at the elections in this city to foreigners. A very large division, we think the great majority of the adopted citizens of Charleston are emigrants from Ireland; many of them Presbyterians from Ulster, several of them members of other Protestant churches, but perhaps we may safely say, the larger portion of them Catholics. Several of those Irish adopted citizens are amongst our most wealthy, industrious, and respectable merchants, men who, though foreigners by birth, have spent their best days in our city and laboured to create its prosperity, whilst they engaged in its commerce and risked their capital, whilst they de-

voted their energies to build up those facilities for industrious enterprise which, if anything can, will make Charleston what she might and ought to be, the emporium of our southern Atlantic coast. Charleston has several English, Scotch, French, German, and other highly respectable merchants of foreign birth, and all the other industrious departments of our city are equally stocked with foreigners. We trust that Governor Wilson has been misreported, for it is impossible, when he looks at this portion of the constituency and at their fellow-citizens of other classes, that he could have deliberately made this charge. Any person who recollects the contest between General Geddes and Mr. Poinsett, twenty years ago, will easily remember, who were then pointed out as the authors, the abettors and agents in the demoralization of the city and the debauchery of its constituency. We are pained to write it, but we must. They were Carolinians, and men moving in the highest circles of its society. They were men who have, since that period, been elected to the highest places of honour, of trust, and of emolument in the state and in the Union.

They who, having any seuse of moral feeling or delicacy, entertain a wholesome shame of the gross and demoralizing inducements held out on other occasions to the venal and corrupt, will easily remember that their authors, we think it was in 1824, were not foreigners.

And if we must recur to the bad scenes of a later period, how many of those, not foreigners, who now declaim against corruption have largely subscribed, have indefatigably laboured, have besought and cajoled and used threats and allurements, promised offices and employments and ministered to cupidity, to distress, to gluttony, and to worse passions, have been found in the worst company, in the worst places, and debauched and imprisoned the wretches whom they thus brought to exercise at the ballot-box the noblest right of freemen? We need not give their names, some of them may be found; and we rejoice at their conversion, and give them honour for their return to virtue; they may be found now conspicious on the list of the advocates of purity, the enemies of corruption, but we should hope, not amongst those who would charge upon foreigners those misdeeds in which they had themselves, unfortunately, taken the leading part.

But the foreigners were the mass which they had to work upon, their disposition to receive the bribe excited the person who had the means to give it. This, at best, is a miserable excuse. It is an avowal that when a person was tempted, he sinned; and it is just the excuse of the person who took the bribe. Of the two perhaps the latter is the more excusable. We come, however, to examine the fact. Do the for-

eigners, as it is now fashionable to style the adopted citizens, constitute the bulk of the profligates and venal voters of the city? We say unhesitatingly that they do not. It is painful, exceedingly so, in this city, where the native and the adopted citizen have lived as brothers, where the emulation was, who should exhibit most kindness and respect to the other, where the charities of life, the courtesies of society, and the affections of fellow-citizens and friends bound together, in a holy union, the mass of our inhabitants, that this harmony is likely to be disturbed by this distinction, and by the obloquy that it produces.

We have more than once made the inquiry and have always found the same result, which is, that unfortunately both native and adopted citizens have combined, on each side of the parties, which politically divide us, to corrupt voters, and that in every instance they have succeeded not only in demoralizing native and adopted citizens, but have unlawfully and criminally used, on both sides, aliens, whom they have in some instances deluded and others debauched. And we must add, that the adopted citizens were not either as corrupters or corrupted, at all equal in number, or even in the ratio of their numbers, to their native companions. And therefore that the charge upon foreigners attributed to Governor Wilson, so far as respects the city of Charleston, come from what quarter it may, is totally void of foundation.

We are happy to perceive even though it should have originated in the spirit of party and not in that of patriotism or of morality, that an opposition is openly avowed to this nefarious practice which, if persisted in, would make our rights a farce, our liberties a curse, and our country a plague spot.

Let not Mr. Boyce or Doctor North, or any party in politics be known on this subject. Let native and foreigner be forgotten. They are miserable minor concerns. Let every citizen determine to banish for ever that corruption which during twenty years has more or less infected our city, and we will do more to bring a blessing upon our state than by the unholy excitement of native or foreigner against each other. Let the citizens of Charleston, native and adopted, be a band of brothers to chase corruption from their city.

We have on more occasions than one, even when several of the present gentlemen who play Simon Pure were to be found descending from the stations which they are so capable of filling with dignity, were to be found bargaining for votes with the off-scourings of our citizens and bringing up whole crews of foreign sailors, in disguise, to our polls and urging them to perjury in a state of half intoxication; we have, as our columns will show, sought according to our little power to abate

this nuisance. And so far as our poor aid may be useful for that object, we are ready again to take our part; but we must say, that we consider the present exhibition of reproof to bribery to be exceedingly injudicious, for it gives the appearance of a party movement to what should be a joint effort of all the parties in our community, without party distinction. We therefore regret the present movement, because, however praiseworthy and virtuous may be the motives and the object of those who charge Mr. Boyce with that profligacy which he denies, it will be attributed by many to a disposition to crush an opponent rather than to purify our city. For our part we have no interest or predilection for the success of either candidate; neither of them is an adopted citizen: they are both native Carolinians; they have both belonged to the same political party: neither belongs to our church. We know not whether either of them is a member of any religious society. In no one point of view have we any concern in the success of either to the exclusion of the other: but a large class with which we are closely connected has been wantonly and injuriously assailed: and knowing the charge to be as unjust as it was uncalled for, we have felt it was our duty to repel it.

We would suggest, what has frequently struck us as the best mode of purifying our elections, of guarding our rights, of protecting our liberty and of vindicating the cause of morality.—That after the excitement of elections shall have subsided, and no suspicion can be attached to the motives of any man, the mayor should call a meeting of our citizens at which an association of all parties may be formed to crush, by their united efforts and by their weight of character, and of numbers, the miscreant who should thereafter attempt to introduce bribery or corruption at our elections.

Should this be done Charleston will occupy a deservedly high place in our Republic.

SECTION X

Foreigners—Bribery:—The following letter from Governor Wilson, appeared on the columns of the *Charleston Courier* of the 1st inst., in answer to the remarks of our paper of December 26th, under the above caption. The Governor having desired that we should copy his letter, we comply with his request, at the same time we protest against his right to address to one of the editors of this paper, by name, his observations on an article which may not have been his production, or even seen by him. As regards the letter itself, our objections to its insertion were,

first, it occupies a large portion of space which we can badly spare; second, it obliges us to devote more of our space to the rejoinder from the writer who takes the name of Green; and third, we do not consider either the matter or the style of the letter such as Governor Wilson need be proud of. This last, however, is no concern of ours; and we have, perhaps, no right to give an opinion upon the subject. If the Governor thinks proper to present himself to the public in such a trim, it is his own affair. Yet we must avow that we should not give insertion to the piece, did it not emanate from a writer whom the Senate of our state had selected to preside over its deliberations, and whom the Legislature of the state had chosen to fill its executive chair. We, therefore, waive our objections and comply with the Governor's request:—

"*To the Right Reverend Consecrated Prelate John, Bishop of Charleston.*[17]

"*Sir*:—I perceive, by the daily papers of the city, you have done me the honour of a passing notice in the *Catholic Miscellany*, a paper under your immediate charge as I have been informed, and the article appears to be editorial. Under these circumstances, I shall make no apology for addressing you personally, with that perfect respect which your station should at all times command, and which is demanded yet more by your talents, ardent love of liberty, and spotless purity of character. But, if I should in anything betray an unbecoming violence of expression, be pleased to set it down to the account of my grandfather on the father's side, who was an Irishman, and not to my Welsh ancestry, whose cold, phlegmatic temperament it would be difficult to awake, except to a sense of wrong. It has been said so long that the current of true love does not always run smooth, that I am forced to admit its truth. But I can add (after some experience), that the current of self-love is not always as smooth as it might be; for I had scarcely made up the account of my indebtedness to your grace, for deeming any remark I may have made in a speech, in the case of a corrupt election, of sufficient importance to be noticed by you, when a friend upset all my self-complacency by telling me that you scarce had a thought of me when you wrote the article. I referred him at once to the paper, where I was stated to have charged the chief profligacy at the late election in this city to foreigners, and triumphantly demanded if that was not proof positive, that but for my speech I should never, perhaps, been introduced into the columns of that purely religious paper, the *Catholic Miscellany?* He smiled at my vanity, and asked me if it was not evident that the real object was to write an electioneering article in favour of Mr. Boyce's re-election to the Senate of this state, seasoning it, at the same time, with a little of that unction most grateful to the heart of a Catholic Irishman! I looked at the article again, and although I was forced to admit, upon a careful perusal, that I was somewhat like the Roman matron who was so ornamented, befurbeleaued, and beflounced that she was lost sight of in the splendour of her dress, yet it was impossible that your apostolic highness could stoop so far below your dignity as to make a scapegoat of me, in order to elevate Mr. Boyce to office, or write an electioneering article and publish it in a paper devoted to religious subjects. My friend now asked me if I had not heard of the large sum lately paid to one of the Catholic churches by Mr. Boyce, for an oratorio which he was unable to attend, on account of his absence from town, and

[17] From the *Charleston Courier* of Jan. 1, 1841.

whilst wearing the proud laurel of senatorial dignity? I answered in the negative. Proceeding in his categories, he then asked me if I had not heard of Mr. Boyce lately giving to two of our valued countrywomen the sum of $200 to aid in paying for the new organ in St. Philip's church? I again answered in the negative; and in return asked if he would insinuate that bribery was making its way into the church? Oh no, he replied, but where money will buy prayers for the dead, it seldom does any injury to the living, either in church or state. Our dialogue ceased, and I was left alone, not a little surprised at what I had just heard.

"I am charged by your right reverend highness with having used expressions calculated to loosen the bonds of amity between the native and adopted citizens of Charleston. It is a grave charge, for among my friends and acquaintances I number several whose natal star is in another hemisphere, whose good opinion I highly prize, and whose moral and political honesty is both unquestioned and unquestionable. To have made such a charge might have alienated them from me for ever, an event which I would deplore, for it is partly by their kindness I live and feed my children. I am sure your apostolic highness will scarcely believe me so weak as to make a general charge of corruption against any class or caste whatever. Every one knows that there are good and bad of every nation and denomination of people. There may be such a thing as a national idiosyncrasy, I admit. Indeed our own country proves this. Where is the similitude between a keen, enterprising New England pedler of wooden clocks, and a Carolina planter? There is about as much likeness as you will find existing between a bale of cotton and a clock.

"As I am unwilling to rest under any imputation which is undeserved, I will beg leave to state in substance, if not in words, what I did say in my speech at Columbia, before the Senate, in order that I may be rightly judged. And permit me to say there is no dignitary in church nor state, nor any power short of that Being who has thus far sustained me through many painful vicissitudes of life, that could induce me to soften a word, or alter the bearing of every word as combined in sentences. I said this, 'That the bribery and corruption practised by Mr. Boyce and his committee men, and partisans, at the late election, was principally confined to that portion of electors who had been born and raised in countries where such practices were of common and ordinary occurrence. They had not their birth in our land of liberty, and very many of them had never exercised the glorious privilege of the elective franchise before their incorporation with us. Many of them fled to our country from oppression, and were yet in humble circumstances, and being ignorant of the theory of our government and institutions, were the more likely to become the prey of the monetary power. But that with deep humiliation I must add, many, very many, of our native sons were also victims of the demoralizing practices that had been resorted to. They were without excuse,' and so forth.

"Now, sir, for whatever there is of error or crime in the above remarks, they are at your service. What I said at Columbia I believed, and that opinion is strengthened and confirmed since my return. You have given your evidence in the matter, and have charged upon the natives the chief burden of the late corruption. Your words are: 'And we must add that the adopted citizens were not, either as corrupters or corrupted, at all equal in number, or even in the ratio of their numbers, to their native companions.' As an adopted citizen, this is bold language to use, even if true. But if not true in the opinion of the public generally, it is not, certainly, calculated to give cement to that bond of union between the native and adopted citizens which you charge me with weakening. If there is that profligacy in our native citizens which

you charge, I conjure you to use, without delay, all the energies and functions of your sacred calling to put it down. To you, and your colabourers in the church, this duty properly belongs. But believe me, my dear sir, the elevation of one to office who has been so lately self-convicted of this practice, is not the surest way of getting rid of the evil.

"With great respect,
"Your obedient servant, and so forth,
"JOHN L. WILSON.

"P. S.—The *Charleston Mercury, Southern Patriot,* and *Catholic Miscellany,* will please insert the above.

"J. L. W."

"*To John L. Wilson, Former Governor of South Carolina and Counsel of the Reformed Electors of St. Philip's and St. Michael's*: [18]

"*Sir*: When men whose opinions carry weight, from the elevated position they hold in society, promulgate sentiments dangerous and derogatory to its best interests, it is a public duty to offer a merited rebuke to this misuse of power over the public mind. There runs lurking through the letter of the gentleman whose name heads this article two preponderating characteristics—an attempt to sneer at the ecclesiastic character of the minister of the Gospel, to whom a large and respectable portion of our citizens look up as their spiritual guide, and whom they regard with reverence—and an effort to draw an invidious distinction between citizens by birth, and citizens by adoption. It is true, these sentiments are not directly avowed, and are in themselves so odious as not to be defended; but the morale of the whole letter, its odour is too distinct to be misunderstood. The insinuation that the Catholic sells prayers for the dead, and lends political aid to the living, from cupidity, is an inference not to be mistaken, from the language used.

"Perhaps Christian charity would have led to the imputation of nobler and purer motives to both the benefactors of religious institutions, and those who vouchsafe the prayers of the pious to him who gives alms.

"My business is with the sectional and national reflections which tarnish this production of one so distinguished among the educated and liberal-hearted sons of the city of Charleston.

"Take the following example: 'There may be such a thing as a national idiosyncrasy, I admit; indeed, our own country proves this. Where is the similitude between a keen, enterprising New England pedler of wooden clocks, and a Carolina planter. There is about as much likeness as you will find between a bale of cotton and a clock.' This is a sentiment of a distinguished lawyer, a former governor, and goes forth as a sample of the enlightened and liberal feelings of Charleston in regard to the people of New England, and as truly exemplifying the distinguished characteristics of the citizens of Charleston and Boston. They are a nation of 'venders of wooden clocks'—the other, of Carolina planters.

"I presume the learned governor meant to speak of a national 'idiocracy' or peculiarity of constitution — what he meant by 'idiosyncracy' is not so easily fathomed. Now, that vending wooden clocks is a peculiarity of the New England constitution, is so vulgar an estimate of the character and pursuits of a country distinguished for her men of letters, her enlightened merchants,

[18] From the *Charleston Courier* of Jan. 4, 1841.

her institutions of education based upon princely endowments, bestowed by that liberal and noble-hearted class of her citizens—her polished society—her gentlemen agriculturalists—whose splendid seats, and cultivated farms are every summer thrown open in profuse and elegant hospitality to all southern gentlemen and ladies—distinguished too by the bold and able statesmen who first exposed and resisted foreign aggression—New England that, at one period of the Revolution, actually furnished two-thirds of the whole army of the Union—whose sons chase the leviathan of the ocean at either pole, and have so often flaunted our glorious banner in the face of the foe, and made old ocean roar with the thunder of her cannon—a nation of pedlers of wooden clocks—that it was to be looked for only from the ignorant and illiterate.

"What would be said of a Boston gentleman and ex-governor, who should, in describing the national idiocracy of South Carolina, characterize her planters as rogues, who sold stones and brick-bats, concealed in bags of cotton by the pound—or, in describing her women, should select as a sample a Wassamasaw vender of eggs and wild ducks? These things will only suit the inmates of taverns and the caterers for the vulgar appetites of ribalds, of the lowest order. If Governor Wilson will seek the society of the wealthy and hospitable merchants of Boston, he will find scholars who will instruct him—lawyers who will enlighten him—ladies whose education fit them both to adorn and illustrate the most polished society. He may rest assured that he would be no more exposed to the intrusion of 'a keen enterprising New England pedler of wooden clocks,' than he would be likely to meet, in the polished and courteous circles of Charleston society, a vulgar swaggerer of a tavern, or the hero or bully of a bar-room. In a word, Governor Wilson may be assured that a gentleman is the product of no one favoured clime, and whether he be a Carolina planter or a New England farmer, scholar or merchant, he is known and appreciated wherever he appears. A man of original and essential vulgarity, whatever fortunes may attend him, will never fail to betray his inherent qualities, which no station or title can efface. So much for your national idiocracy, which is a most signal failure at a worn-out, obsolete, and most pointless jeer.

"He adds, speaking of a remark of Bishop England 'as an adopted citizen, this is bold language to use even if true.' Indeed! Then it is an extraordinary act of boldness in an adopted citizen to tell the truth, and but a modest liberty in a native to resort to a poor and low prejudice against his own countrymen—the very men who began and never deserted the conflict which made us a nation! Are our adopted citizens then so degraded that they cannot, but in trembling accents; speak the truth, while it is a royal prerogative of one whose parent destiny so happened as to bring him to light hereabouts, to sport with the well-established facts of history to minister to the most untutored prejudices of the very dregs of society? for a Carolina gentleman would blush to be thought capable of confounding an educated, enterprising, public-spirited and hospitable people, with any of the mere trading and huckstering classes that infest every society, from dealers in wooden nutmegs to the wretches, who, under the name of Carolina planters, sell cotton-seeds and stones, for the real 'good fair to good.' If there is indeed an order of nobility in this state, not even graced by ancient recollections of chivalric ancestry, or based upon superior piety, sobriety, and morality, but resting upon the mere fact, common to the very negroes who clean their boots—which no merit can ever attain—if there is such an aristocracy, one thing is certain, that none will claim it more pertinaciously, or insist with more tenacity upon this 'insolent prerogative,' than those who feel conscious that they have no more available claim to distinction in the society

in which they move.—And now, in conclusion, there does appear to be an effort to rally in opposition to Mr. Boyce, a party whose object is to decry and degrade that portion of our citizens who were not born in South Carolina. The plain statement of the lurking bias will be its best antidote, for none will more promptly and effectually silence such an attempt, than all of whom Carolina loves to boast as her cherished sons. The degraded and fallen only, who, having dissipated everything else, and having left only what they cannot get rid of, their accident of birth to boast of, will ever tarnish the illustrious fame of their native state by degrading prejudices, or disingenuous sectional reflections. The 'national idiocracy' alluded to, must have been a thoughtless jest, which an enlightened lawyer and former dignitary of this chivalric state would never seriously sanction—and it is to be hoped that so it will be estimated abroad, for the sake of the honour and hospitality of our state. GREENE.

"N. B.—The papers, which published Governor Wilson's address, will please insert this."

"*To John L. Wilson, Esq.*[19]

"*Sir*:—In your article in the *Courier* of the 1st instant, to Bishop England, you say, 'My friend now asked me if I had not heard of the large sum lately paid to one of the Catholic Churches, by Mr. Boyce, for an oratorio, which he was unable to attend, on account of his absence from town,' and so forth. Now, as members of the committee of the oratorio given, at St. Mary's Church during the absence of Mr. Boyce from this city, we take this opportunity to say to you that the friend you allude to has misinformed you, as we know that Mr. Boyce has not contributed to said oratorio.

"FRIENDS TO TRUTH."

[19] From the *Charleston Courier* of Jan. 4, 1841.

VINDICATION OF JUDGE GASTON

[The letter of Judge Gaston prefixed to the brief article written by Dr. England in his vindication, was copied from the Lexington (Va.) *Gazette* into the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, No. 38, of Vol. XV., for 1836. The article itself, written in reply to the attack of the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine* on the illustrious Catholic jurist of North Carolina, upon whose good fame death has since set a sacred and inviolable seal, appeared in the 41st No. of the same volume.]

JUDGE GASTON

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette.

Sir:—May I ask the favour of you to publish in your valuable journal, for the information of your subscribers and the public generally, the letter of Judge Gaston, which will be found in the *Lexington (Va.) Gazette*, of the 5th inst., together with the introductory remarks of the editor of that paper. In making this request, I am prompted by the sole motive of contributing to the refutation of a calumny heretofore circulated in this city (where I believe it most wantonly originated) against one of the purest patriots and most enlightened jurists to be found in this or any other country, and a gentleman whom I have the pleasure of numbering amongst my personal and most esteemed friends.

A Subscriber.

HONORABLE WM. GASTON [20]

The reader will find below a letter from this gentleman to the editor of this paper, on the subject of the charge preferred against him by "Senex," of procuring from the Bishop of Baltimore, an ecclesiastical permission to hold an office under the State of North Carolina, which the constitution of that state expressly disqualified him from holding; in other words, authorizing to commit perjury; for the Judge could not enter upon the duties of the office without first swearing to support the state constitution.

We wish our motives in publishing this letter to be distinctly understood. We do not publish it for any bearing it may have upon the questions heretofore in controversy between "Senex" and ourselves; that is altogether incidental and undesigned. We publish it simply from a

[20] From the *Lexington (Va.) Gazette.*

sense of justice to Judge Gaston, to the elevated station he occupies, and to the state of North Carolina, which has conferred that station upon him, and whose fame is involved in that of her sons. Our paper has been made the vehicle of a calumny; it is proper, therefore, that it should be made the vehicle also of the refutation of that calumny.

We had hoped to have been spared the necessity of publishing this letter. "Senex" knows that we employed the only means in our power to absolve us from the necessity, but unfortunately without success.

We do not mean, by anything we have said, to reflect in the slightest degree upon the conduct of "Senex" in making this charge. His error, we sincerely believe, was one purely of the head, such as we are all liable to commit.

This letter must satisy every candid mind that the charge is wholly unfounded. The Judge's positive denial would be sufficient to prove this, particularly as the evidence by which it is attempted to be sustained is of the very weakest character.

All who know Judge Gaston, know that his character is without reproach, and above suspicion. The high and most responsible station which he occupies by the election of his Protestant fellow-citizens, with whom he has spent his life, shows that his character is without a stain. If the charge is true, the Judge is not only a liar and a perjured scoundrel, but a "fool" too; for if the facts which he states are not true, would it not be the height of folly in him to publish them to the world, when their falsity can so easily be established? Would he not thus furnish unequivocal evidence of his guilt? and that, too, to persons who would seize upon it with ferocious avidity? But with those who question the Judge's veracity we have no argument. The letter itself bears upon its face convincing proof of his candour. We commend it to our readers.

Raleigh, Dec. 29th, 1835.

To Mr. C. C. Baldwin.

Sir:—I had the pleasure of receiving yesterday, and not before, your letter of the 17th of October, addressed to me at this place. The number of the *Lexington Gazette* referred to in the letter as accompanying it, was forwarded to Newbern, the place of my residence, some time since. In consequence of the editorial article in the *Gazette*, I caused to be transmitted to you two newspapers containing a speech which I made in our late state convention. I presume that you have received these, and that they furnish most, if not all, of the facts about which you inquire.

The publication to which the editorial article is an answer I have

not met with. From the nature, however, of that answer I infer that it contains a vile charge, for my having obtained some ecclesiastical dispensation or permission to hold an office under the state of North Carolina, and relieving me from the guilt of perjury in violating my oath to support the constitution of the state. I know that a charge to this effect has been made in a periodical work published at Baltimore, called (I think) *The Religious and Literary Magazine*, for not long after the adjournment of the convention, and while I was yet here occupied with the duties of the Supreme Court, a copy of the *Magazine* containing such an accusation was sent on to me, and as I suppose, by the conductors of the work. It is not easy to determine when it is proper to come forth with a denial of a calumnious charge, and when it is most becoming to treat it with silent contempt. The accusation in question seemed to me so preposterous, so ridiculous, that it was scarcely possible for me to notice it gravely without subjecting myself to ridicule, or the manifestation of a morbid sensibility. But I was saved from all difficulty in deciding on the course then to be pursued. The style of the article was so uncourteous, and the temper which it breathed so malignant, that self-respect utterly forbade me from paying any notice to it.

But your inquiries, sir, are evidently prompted by a sincere desire to know the truth, and made in a manner that demands my respectful consideration. If, therefore, it will afford you any satisfaction to have my peremptory denial of the accusation, I have no hesitation in stating that it is wholly false. It is no doubt but a mere repetition of the Baltimore slander, and that professes to be mainly founded on the asserted fact, that I withheld my assent to be put in nomination for the office of Judge until after I had visited Baltimore. This allegation is itself utterly false. My lamented friend, Chief Justice Henderson, died in August, 1833. In a few days afterwards I was informed of the occurrence, and urged by gentlemen of the highest standing in the state, upon public grounds, to permit myself to be considered as willing to accept the vacant office, if it should please the Legislature to confer it. Strong reasons were also presented for pressing an early decision. There were also difficulties in the way of an immediate determination, but these had no connexion whatever with consitutional scruples.

I had had occasion but a short time before, to examine for myself and to seek the best council to examine the disqualifications for office which some supposed the constitution denounced against the professors of the Roman Catholic faith. I was satisfied that my religious principles did not incapacitate me from taking the office. But there were personal considerations which compelled delay. It was unnecessary to set these forth,

—but that which was last removed arose from pecuniary engagements which I had contracted, and which I feared the great sacrifice of emolument that would follow on quitting the bar might disable me punctually to comply with. Justice and honour required that a satisfactory arrangement of these matters should be concluded before I consented to be removed from the bar to bench. This was done by an early day in September, and then I gave my written consent to be nominated for the vacant office, and my permission that this determination might be publicly known.

A very laborious fall circuit closed in the first week in November. From it I went on a long-promised visit to see my daughter, who was settled in New York. I travelled by Norfolk and Baltimore, and passed one day in the latter place, and, as well as I recollect, one only. It had been supposed by several who took a deep interest in my receiving the appointment, that it would be bestowed without opposition. They had afterwards ascertained that this was a mistaken opinion, and had informed me before I left Carolina that doubts had been expressed on the constitutional question, and difficulties raised about it. Having an hour of leisure when at Baltimore, I wrote to one of my zealous friends residing at Raleigh, stating the views which I had taken of the constitutional question, and authorizing him to give publicity to them, that their correctness or incorrectness might be judged of. I have understood, and have no doubt of the fact, that this letter was read by my friend at his table in the presence of several distinguished gentlemen, among others the great and good John Marshall, and that copies of it were taken. This is the letter which has afforded the pretext for the falsehood (I hope a falsehood through mistake), that my assent to be put in nomination had been withheld until after I reached Baltimore.

It is needless, surely, for me to go farther,—but I will add, that I never had any intercourse, verbal or written, direct or indirect, with the Bishop of Baltimore on the subject; and that I did not, directly or indirectly, confer with any individual belonging or professing to belong to the Catholic Church upon the subject (out of my own household) until after I had announced my unconditional assent to be put in nomination for the office.

What use you may make of this communication I leave entirely to your sense of propriety. It is not a pleasant matter for any man of character or feeling to have a discussion entertained on the question whether he has or has not acted as a scoundrel and a fool; and I regard the wantonness with which men's characters are dragged before the public, the facility with which slanders are credited, and the rashness with

which unfounded imputations are attributed by political or sectarian rancour, as among the worst vices of the age. If any public motive should require that the miserable calumny to which I have referred should be contradicted or repelled, you have here my authority for so doing. But [I trust] that a life of nearly threescore years has established for me a character, such as it is, that does not require to be defended or propped. I could wish, therefore, that I might be permitted to pass the remainder of my days in the quiet discharge of my duties, and that no further notice should be taken of this contemptible falsehood. You will, however, act in relation to it as your judgment shall direct.

With very respectful sentiments,

I am, sir,

Your obliged and humble servant,

WILL. GASTON.

We have this week received a little pamphlet of ten or eleven pages, purporting to be an extract from the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, for this month. It is entitled, *An Address to the American People*, and comes from the senior editor of the *Magazine* itself, Reverend Robert J. Breckenridge.

The nature of this address may be known from its introduction, which we give in words and figures and mode of print, exactly as we find it:

HONORABLE MR. GASTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA.—CATHOLIC PERFIDITY.—PROSTITUTION OF THE PUBLIC PRESS.

"Being on the eve of departing from the United States, in discharge of a public duty committed to my hands, by that branch of the church of Jesus Christ, of which I am a member, I feel myself imperiously bound by a sense of what is due to myself, as well as to the cause of truth and public morality, to lay before my countrymen the following correspondence; for I am well aware, that the same religious principles which teach men to swear falsely, and keep no faith with those who, as they say, have no faith will prompt those who are so tardy and reluctant to speak even in necessary explanation, when I am present and ready to reply, to be bold and prompt even in attack, when I am far away; nor can I doubt, that the prostitution of the public press to the Catholic superstition, which has wrought me so much injury, though so great injustice in despite of all my personal efforts to the contrary, will lend itself to the same designs in circumstances more favourable to success.

"I have then solemnly to call the attention of the American people to the facts established by the following papers, which will go far to show: 1. That the Roman Catholic religion not only admits, but approves of false swearing, when Papists can gain advantage thereby. 2. That the political newspapers of the day, to some ex-

tent, applaud this tremendous principle; and, to a still greater extent, are grossly subservient to the religious sect which teaches and practises it!''

The attention of the reader is directed first to the letter of Judge Gaston, of North Carolina, and the introductory remarks which precede it, both of which are taken from the *Lexington (Va.) Gazette*, of February 5th, 1836.

The letter of Judge Gaston, which we some time since copied, is then set forth, and it is followed by a very extraordinary production of Mr. Breckenridge, in the shape of a letter to the editor of the *Lexington Gazette*, in which he complains that the Hon. Judge treated him with ''contemptuous silence,'' when in his *Magazine* he charged the Judge with perjury, because he took the oath of office when he was elected to that station which he decorates by his talent and his virtue. He requests the editor will insert his ''article of four or five pages'' of attack, printed last July in his *Magazine*, entitled *Judge Gaston, of North Carolina, Religious Liberty, Mental Reservation.* He then proceeds to say, that Judge Gaston ''continuing to be a Roman Catholic, swore that be believed the Protestant religion to be true;'' to prove this, he quotes the thirty-second article of the old Constitution of the State of North Carolina:

''This, sir, is the plain matter-of-fact of the case. By the thirty-second article of the late Constitution of North Carolina, it was provided, 'that no person who shall deny the being of God, or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit, in the civil government within this state.' Yet Judge Gaston, being and continuing a Papist, was appointed a judge under this constitution, and actually took the usual oaths to support that which he trampled under foot, even while he called God to witness, that he believed that to be true, which in his secret soul he was satisfied was false!!

''You will allow me, sir, to say, in my own defence, that I have been kicked into this Popish controversy, by the priests and others around me: that the case of Judge Gaston was no private matter, but a public and official act; that as such, it has been used as a strong and frightful illustration of the natural and necessary fruits of a false and bloody superstition, which is spreading in all directions in this country, and which foreign states and princes are conspiring to establish as the public religion of America; and that, in the whole case, the talents, public services, and private virtues of Judge Gaston have been fully admitted, indeed stated; but this act of his is undeniable and indefensible, and which, while it persecutes on principle all who reject it, at the same time corrupts all who receive it.

''If you will look at the article to which I have already alluded, you will discover that four grounds of defence set up by the friends of this gentlemen, are slightly examined: 1. That the provision in the Constitution of North Carolina was a mere dead letter. 2. That he was not bound to know what was meant by the terms 'Protestant religion,' as they were not defined either in the laws or constitu-

tion of his state. 3. That the oath he took was actually true; and that, though a Catholic, he might believe the Protestant religion to be true. 4. That he got a dispensation to take this oath. These were actual defences which I had heard suggested in his own state, by his own friends, over and over, during two journeys entirely across the state, in two different directions, which I had then recently taken. For the notice taken of them, I refer you to the printed article."

He then appears to think that it would have been a better excuse for the Judge to have admitted that he got the dispensation, and acted under it, than to deny that he got it, and say that he took the oath without; and avows that he only repeats what he has learned, "admitting as relatively probable, what hundreds disposed to excuse the Judge repeated as true."

The Lexington editor declined the insertion, as it was inconvenient to him for many reasons, which he specifies, to admit religious controversy into his columns, and amongst them the following:

"But, sir, I would not entertain this controversy, if the Pope were to release me from my pledges, because it would exclude more useful and interesting matter from my paper, (a small weekly sheet,) and is entirely uncalled for, there being scarcely an individual in the county who does not consider the Church of Rome as a sink of iniquity, and the enemy of God and man. Why, sir, a good many of my subscribers stopped their papers, because I dared to defend the Catholics, and all of them censured me for saying a word in their favour.

"A Catholic controversy is as much out of place in my paper, as a political controversy would be in your magazine. Your main reason, then, for asking the insertion of your communication in the *Gazette* is overruled.

"Judge Gaston's letter was in reply to the charge of 'Senex,' that he had obtained a dispensation from the Bishop of Baltimore to commit perjury, and not in answer to the article in your periodical. He merely mentions that your magazine had made a similar charge against him; but this surely does not make you a party to the controversy, or give you any 'right' to reply through my paper. If Judge Gaston has done you any specific injury, through my paper, most certainly you shall be permitted to redress it; but you must confine yourself to that point."

Yet even this compliment, of "the sink of iniquity," and "the enemy of God and man," is not enough to satisfy Mr. Robert J. Breckenridge, and he asserts that the editor's refusal was founded on pretexts. By the by, we would remark, that in this same part of Virginia, where this complimentary notion of the Church of Rome is entertained, ten years have elapsed since we have been assured by a respectable priest, that only a few months previously he had been obliged to submit to the examination of his head, to satisfy the well-informed and enlightened brethren in the faith of Mr. Robert J. Breckenridge, that he had no horns, after which they took his word for his having no tail.

Mr. Breckenridge next states that he applied to the editor of the *Baltimore Gazette*, requesting that, as he published Judge Gaston's

letter, copying it from the *Lexington Gazette*, he would publish his reply, and the refusal of the Lexington editor. The editor wrote a respectful reply, which is also given, declining the publication, as, convinced by experience, that it could not be usefully or safely admitted into the columns of a newspaper.

Thus disappointed, he wrote to the editor of the *Baltimore Chronicle* the following note:

"BALTIMORE, March 9, 1836.

"Robert J. Breckenridge presents his respects to Mr. Barnes, and begs leave to trouble him, so far as to ask his attention to the subject contained in the packet of letters sent him herewith.

"The entire object of this application is to obtain the publication in the *Chronicle*, of the letter addressed by R. J. B. to the *Lexington (Va.) Gazette*; and which was refused first by that paper, and then by the *Gazette* of this city, for reasons and under circumstances which the letters of Messrs. Baldwin and Gwynn will explain.

"He is the more urgent for the publication of the letter which he asks Mr. B. to admit into his journal; because, as he is on the eve of leaving the United States, he wishes Mr. Gaston to see, as early as possible, the position which he is resolved to occupy, as regards a subject with relation to which all the whole Catholics and half Catholics in the country, seem already so perfectly organized for Mr. Gaston, and against the very clearest principles of morality and public virtue.

"Alas! sir, if public men are allowed in the most formal, official acts, to take false oaths, and those who love truth well enough to remark on it, are to be held up to public scorn, and then denied the only effectual means of defence, because there is a certain superstition in the country which tolerates false swearing, then, indeed, the public press and the public morals too are sadly out of joint."

And in his publication, he appends to his letter to the editor of the *Baltimore Gazette*, the following kind and charitable note to the following portion of his text: "It is now above a year since the paper you now edit, (which was then controlled by another person,[21]) published repeated attacks on me, and refused to allow me to defend myself."

After this set of documents, the address is wound up to its conclusion, in the following words:—

"And is it so great a crime to love truth? Has it ceased to be a sin against God, and a crime under our laws, and an offence against good morals, for fraud and falsehood to be formally and even officially committed? No, this is not so, by any means. If I had acted as Judge Gaston has, my sect would have deposed me from

[21] "This individual, who, though nominally a Protestant, was, as an editor, the mere creature of the Papist party, and especially of the priests, is now in the Maryland penitentiary, for robbing the Baltimore post-office. I deplore his unhappy fate; but, at the same time, I cannot too gratefully recall the goodness of God, that has so soon brought to light and to just punishment a man whose position gave him great power, a power which he used in the most cruel manner to undermine my character, at the same moment that other minions of the priests were threatening my life. God has thus far signally preserved me from both conspiracies."

my ministry—my congregation would have shut my church doors against me—my friends would have wept over me, as one undone—and the whole world would have had but one opinion about it—and that opinion would have been that I was a degraded man. Then, why not mete the same measure to Judge Gaston? I will tell you why. It is because Judge Gaston is a Papist; and his creed admits and approves his conduct. And therefore, let every man that loves God, pity and forgive Judge Gaston; and frown down his pestiferous superstition, as the parent of all vice, and the enemy of every virtue!

"But is the public press already Catholic or Infidel? Is the whole editorial corps converted, subsidized, afraid, or totally indifferent? No, this is by no means so. If a Methodist judge was to take a false oath, or a Presbyterian judge commit a flagrant violation of morality, or an Episcopal judge outrage public decency, or a Deistical judge be guilty of deliberate perfidy in official affairs, in all these cases, the public press would fully respond to the public feeling—and the judge would be disgraced, if not degraded! Why deal out a different measure to a Catholic judge? I will tell you why. It is because every Catholic in the world makes common cause with every other Catholic in the world, and with the Pope of Rome, as the head of all the world, and with the Catholic church, as the mother and mistress of all the churches in the world! Virtue is nothing, truth is nothing, religion is nothing, country is nothing: the church is all: and the Pope its head, and all its true members form one universal conspiracy against every good of man, and the honour of God himself. Printers feel the force, though they may deny the reality of this conspiracy. If Mr. Gwynn abuses me, or any other Protestant, in his paper, no one interferes; it is a personal affair, to be decided on its merits. If he writes ten lines against Archbishop Eccleston, in eight days, his paper would probably be ruined. And this, although every word he has said of him were pregnant with truth, and vital to the public welfare! Oh! then let every man that loves his race, his children, his inestimable rights, his glorious country, rouse himself up to the contemplation of the principles and designs of this atrocious society, which aims at no less than the universal monarchy of the world; and which, though it pursues this object under the guise of religion, is bound by no principle, human or divine. Oh! how willingly would I become their victim, if that might be the means of making my country feel that every sentiment of patriotism, every emotion of philanthropy, and every principle of true religion equally impel us to suppress, by all lawful means, this unparalleled superstition, as the enemy alike of God and man.

"Ro. J. Breckenridge.

"Baltimore, March 12, 1836."

We have the honour of knowing Judge Gaston, and we feel pained that so pure and gifted a son of America should be thus assailed, even were it by a maniac. We know something of Mr. Ro. J. Breckenridge, and of the fantastic tricks which he played in Baltimore; and we do know the whole history of what he is pleased to call perjury and dispensation. We have heretofore, through respect for Judge Gaston, abstained from interfering in this matter, and probably we shall act against his wishes and feelings, and judgment, in noticing it even now.

The value of oaths in the estimation of Catholics is evident, from

the notorious fact, as honourable to one party as it is disgraceful to the other, that the British and Irish Catholics, until 1829, and the American Catholics, until the period of the revolution, were kept under the most galling yoke of a bitter and degrading persecution, merely because they would not do what Mr. Ro. J. Breckenridge asserts Judge Gaston has done, viz., swear that they believed the Protestant religion to be true. The charge then made upon the Catholics, as a body, is utterly false, and false to the knowledge of every man who has cognizance of this fact; and to us it is most strange, if Mr. Ro. J. Breckenridge has yet to learn this portion of history. The charge, as respects the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, is utterly false, and false to the knowledge of every person who has the least information regarding those tenets; and to us it would appear very strange, that Mr. Ro. J. Breckenridge, who is in his own estimation and in that of thousands of our fellow-citizens, a teacher in Israel, should be destitute of such information.

Now we come to Mr. Gaston's case. This gentleman never took any oath in this case, save to do the duties of the office to which he was appointed by the state. He was not required to swear that he believed in the truth or falsehood of any religion. The candidate is not the judge of his own qualifications: the state committed to certain functionaries the selection of certain officers, gave them rules by which they were to be guided in the selection. It was notorious to every one concerned, in making the appointment, that Mr. Gaston was a Roman Catholic, he avowed it, he proclaimed it, he gloried in it. Mr. Gaston was no candidate for the office; it was after repeated solicitation from persons who could confer it, that he consented to accept it. It was they who were charged not to confer it upon a disqualified person; they knew that Mr. Gaston was a Roman Catholic; if he was disqualified, it was they who forced the office upon one whom they knew to be disqualified who violated their duty. If it was law that they should not give him the office, the violation of that law was on their side; they, not he, were appointed to execute it. We do not say that he would act correctly in permitting himself to be made the instrument for its violation. We merely have established this point, that if there was an unconstitutional appointment, they who violated their trust, were not Catholics. Many of them were of that sect to which Mr. Ro. J. Breckenridge belongs, and which he says would depose him if he did what they induced Mr. Gaston to do.

But the question properly is, whether there was a violation of the law on the part of those who made the appointment.

Some years ago, the general impression was upon the minds of the

few Catholics in North Carolina, that they were excluded from office, by the article in question—probably Mr. Gaston himself was of that opinion; he is known to have spoken doubtingly upon the subject, about fifteen years since, and to have then alleged as a reason for declining an office which some of his friends wished him to take, that he would prefer waiting until he could be better satisfied as to the full and precise legal effect of this very curious and discreditable 32d article.

North Carolina is not in the Diocess of Baltimore, but in that of Charleston, and the very case in question came for examination, in an ecclesiastical point of view, not before the Archbishop of Baltimore, who was not the ordinary prelate, but before Dr. England, the Bishop of Charleston, who was, and is the ordinary, not in the case of Judge Gaston, but in three other distinct cases; and a decision was had several years before Judge Gaston took that oath which Ro. J. Breckenridge has called perjury.

In Salisbury, a Roman Catholic was elected chief magistrate, and entered upon office at the request of his respectable fellow-citizens of the various Protestant denominations—whilst in office, he desired to be admitted to the sacraments; the clergyman to whom he applied, hesitated to admit him, upon the ground of his having violated the constitution of the state, in accepting an office from which Catholics were excluded by the 32d article. He said that he had been advised by good lawyers, that this was a mistake, that the article could not be so construed, and that he would keep the office to which his fellow-citizens elected him, and also insist upon his religious rights, unless it should be proved that he had been badly advised upon the subject. The priest applied to the Bishop of Charleston, for instructions how to act. The answer of the prelate was to the effect that he should in the first instance be satisfied, not by his own private views, but by the best advice that he could obtain from professional gentlemen, as to the exact meaning of the article in question—and that if by its fair construction Catholics were excluded, the person in question could not be admitted to the sacraments, if he did not resign the office. And further, that if previous to entering into office he was required to swear that he was constitutionally qualified, he had sworn rashly, amidst such doubts, and could not be excused from censure. By a very unusual coincidence, the good Protestants of Wilmington, and of Fayetteville had made similar elections, and the bishop was also consulted respecting the ecclesiastical standing of those other Catholic magistrates. He was distinctly informed that no oath requiring their declaration of constitutional qualification was administered, and the copy of the oath of office was fur-

nished to him. Inquiry was made of the best jurists in the state. Mr. Gaston, not only from the legal rank which he occupied, but also from the peculiar attention which he must have paid to the subject, and from the great respect and confidence entertained for him by the bishop, was amongst others naturally called upon; and after a thorough examination, it was distinctly ascertained that the best lawyers in North Carolina were of opinion that whatever the object of the framers of that article may have been, it clearly was not drawn in such a manner as to exclude Catholics from office, and that for any Catholic to refuse office upon that ground, would be to force upon the article a construction which it did not legally bear, and thus to enact a persecution against the body to which he belonged, exactly such as would gratify the kind and courteous Ro. J. Breckenridge, who has escaped so many imaginary dangers to which he has been exposed, through the support which he gives to what he calls religion, by means which we shall not stoop to describe.

Thus, it appears from the above statement, that whether erroneously or otherwise, the principal Protestant jurists of North Carolina had assured the Roman Catholics that they were not disqualified for office by the unfortunate article in question; and the Protestants of Salisbury, of Fayetteville, and of Wilmington, acted upon this view of the law, and elected them to office, and Mr. Gaston, after still further investigation and consultation, had every shadow of doubt removed from his mind, and told the writer of this article, that he did not know a respectable jurist in Carolina, who had any hesitation as to the eligibility of Catholics. Thus, after years of examination and reflection, the whole Protestant legal talent of the state gave to this very article a construction upon which the executive and legislative bodies have acted in concord in making the appointment of Judge Gaston to the bench, and because he accepts the office and takes the usual oath to discharge its duty, the Rev. Ro. J. Breckenridge dares to arraign for perjury one of the most deservedly respected men, for purity of principle, for high honour, for moral worth, for legal and political conduct, and for talent, taste, and information that his state possesses.

We have heard some persons charge Ro. J. Breckenridge with having taken his peculiar mode of polemics for the purpose of attracting more attention, and getting better supported by his party, whilst others excused him on the plea of a peculiarity of head. To us, it matters nothing whther he acts from calculation, from insanity, or from delusion. We leave him and his vile and vulgar productions, to their admirers, whilst we deeply regret the connexion, even as a calumniator, of the name of Ro. J. Breckenridge, with that of Will. Gaston.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

[The first of the three short articles that follow, which may have an interest for some, as a reminiscence of "Bishop England's School," is extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* No. 9 of Vol. I., for 1822. The second, though a mere *jeu d'esprit,* apparently thrown off to amuse an idle moment, and to fill a vacant column, alludes to a subject which furnishes matter for deep and philosophical reflection, and, as it were, in one or two broken hints, points out one most especial way in which the Catholic religion is a blessing, and Protestantism a curse to the human race; the first, by producing and preserving *mental health*—the latter, by causing and perpetuating *mental disease.* This article is taken from the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* No. 6 of Vol. XVIII., for 1838. The third, valuable, as the only article, so far as is known to the editors, written by Bishop England, upon a topic which, at the time, was one of absorbing interest, was published in the *Catholic Miscellany,* No. 34 of Vol. XX., for 1841.]

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

PROTEUS, A WRITER WITH FOUR NAMES

Just before the publication of our last number, and too late for insertion therein, we received a letter with the signature "Candor," written at full length, an imperfect attempt at a signature commencing with "H.," and another commencing with "Fair"—the two last imperfectly blotted; so that the writer forgot his own name. It reminded us of the story of an old gentleman of the Society of Friends, who was sometimes rather absent, and calling at the post-office to inquire, "Hast thou any letters for me?" "Your name, sir," the clerk not being a Friend. "My name—my name—verily I have forgotten." Having walked off a few paces, an acquaintance met him, and saluted "Friend Grub;" upon which, returning, he immediately told the clerk, "Now, friend, I recollect my name is Grub." But he was more happy than "H., Fair," or "Candor," or "An Observer"—for truly, instead of two, our friend has four names. Between addressing to us his letter of three signatures, and to the *Southern Intelligencer* that of one signature, he evidently forgot his name; we hope he may keep this as a memorandum, to recollect his name in future.

As the substance of both letters is the same, though their diction is quite dissimilar, the publication of one will suffice. We, therefore, to save ourselves, and our printer trouble, give that which appeared in

the *Southern Intelligencer* of Saturday; another motive for our doing so is, that Mr. Proteus, because we think a man who changes his name, deserves the appellation equally with him who changes his shape, may be tempted to write another letter to his friend Ithuriel, to know why we published his letter instead of our own; and we should like to see Proteus frequently exhibited, if we were only to admire his chameleon facilities. The following, then, is the letter from the *Intelligencer*:

"From an editorial headed "France," in the *Catholic Miscellany*, of July 17, 1822, I extract these remarks:—

" 'There are schools of infidelity and schools of religion, and there are schools of mere human learning. The first, are, indeed, schools of perdition, and such schools, the philantrophists wish for; the second, the missionaries would support, and exert themselves, nay, sacrifice themselves to maintain and uphold; the third they approve of, but look upon to be imperfect, because they believe man is made for the next world, not for this; but establish a school upon the two last principles, and those missionaries will endure a martyrdom to uphold it.'

"Let the reader mark these words which I have italicized. Permit me to inquire, is the Catholic school in our city, an imperfect one? or according to the sentiments here expressed, is it one of those which the missionaries would exert themselves to maintain and uphold—is it a school for religion, and not merely for human learning? If it be not an 'imperfect school,' why are not the public informed? and then Protestants would know how they ought to act. They would have a view of the whole ground.

"Again: Are not all the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church considered as missionaries? The French missionaries support schools of religion, and do not the American missionaries do the same? Are the latter less zealous than the former? If an American missionary of Rome sets up a school, will he set up an imperfect one, or the contrary? will he not 'support,' exert 'himself, nay, sacrifice himself,' and 'endure a martyrdom' 'to uphold' a school for religion? Finally, is it not candid in the French missionaries to say that they prefer to the Lancasterian school, a school of religion—and that their schools are not intended merely to inculcate human learning?

"An Observer.

"P. S. Will not the Catholic schools in America, in due season, be improved to the French standard, if they are not already formed on the perfect plan which is only known at present to the initiated? Have they not a common object with the *Miscellany* and the *Cathedral*?"

Now, to answer these fourteen questions would be very trouble-

some, and, besides, Proteus could not expect that we should lead him into all our *arcana*, nor into those of the conductors of "the Catholic school in this city." First, we will not lead him into ours, for we are great rogues, and rogues do not like to tell secrets; secondly, we will not lead him into those of the conductors of "the Catholic school of this city," because we do not know such a school, nor such conductors, and to tell him the secrets of non-existents, would be a hard task.

We suppose, by Catholic school, he means the seminary under the inspection of the Catholic bishop, in which the religion of the children is neither known nor inquired into; but in which, we believe, the number of Catholic children is the smallest, in proportion to the others. If this be his meaning, his object is apparent. His letter is but the public repetition, by insinuation, of a vile calumny, which has been industriously propagated through this city, during the last six months, and disseminated by individuals whom we, at one time, mistook for gentlemen and men of honour; as well as by the herd whose character was always too well marked, and too plainly known, to admit the possibility of deception.

We will venture to say, that the conductors of the Philosophical and Classical Seminary, will give themselves as little concern about the fickle being who now openly assails the institution, as they have done about the moles, who, at an earlier period, sought to undermine it. The parents and the friends of their pupils, well know how to estimate the weight of the insinuations; and to those and the pupils themselves, they will leave to answer the writers and the whisperers, who would endeavour to make the city of Charleston the theatre of bigotry, and to draw into private life, and across the social circle, the line which should be confined to mark only the public boundaries of religion.

Not content with publicly insinuating what every person knows to be false, the writer more than insinuates against the Roman Catholic bishop, charges of hypocrisy, deliberate lying, and the worst species of deceit—for that gentleman publicly pledged himself in the prospectus, that no religious instruction, of any kind whatsoever, should be introduced into the seminary.

For ourselves, we repeat our assertion—"Roman Catholic missionaries approve of schools of mere human learning, though they consider them to be imperfect, because they teach only the learning of this world, not that of the next, which is better;" and of this latter learning, they are more ready to be the channels of communication; but, they may feel convinced, that they are bound by a solemn contract, publicly made, and upon the faith of which, the parents of children who differ from them

in religion, have entrusted their sons to their charge; when they violate this, we shall be amongst the first to declare, that they have forfeited the public confidence by the breach of their contract, and to say that no child, of any denomination, should be placed under their care.

EDUCATION—INSANITY

It is, our readers will say, a very curious juxtaposition, yet it is not that we are about to say, as was said of St. Paul, that too much learning made him mad.

One of the most insolent and most unfounded assertions of some of the modest gentlemen, who are filled with spurious pity for the delusion of Papists, is, that the Protestant religion, is now, and always has been, the friend of science, and that Popery has been allied to ignorance. Hence, the old and young boys who, in these states, are selected to make public orations, or to spout at college commencements, seldom allow an opportunity of the kind to pass without rounding off a few periods with the light shed by Luther, and the Reformation, the mariner's compass, gas, and the blow-pipe; steam-engines and safety valves, have not yet been superadded to Doctor Faustus and the printing press. We could bear all this with Christian patience, and be sufficiently just to reciprocate the pity so generously bestowed, where it was neither needed nor desired;—but when the Catholics are parcelled out into classes, and those accounted most happy and enlightened, who dwell amongst Protestants, and their literature, their civilization, and their freedom, are asserted to be in the direct ratio of their proximity to Protestantism, we get somewhat discontented and impatient; for we perceive a great deterioration of our powers of perception, and detect a wonderful delusion of our mind.

We have lived chiefly in the midst of Protestants, and can feel happy at knowing that several most respectable men and women of their persuasion, are amongst our most worthy and most intimate friends;—but in good sooth, we never found that they were beings of a superior race, elevated midway between Papists and the heavenly intelligences. We found them to be like all other kinds of men and women, some with good clear heads, and some a little thick and muddy, just like Papists.

We also found that some of them had good information and others were just so so. If then the assertion to which we have alluded be true, our powers of perception are greatly at fault.

But moreover we have laboured under a great delusion, and what is worse, it is likely to continue. We do verily believe, perhaps it is only

imagination, that the best-informed Catholics we ever met with, were men who lived at a great distance from Protestants, and who never had the advantages of their tuition, proximity, or example. We therefore were led to believe that it was possible to have learning, education, civilization, and liberty, though Protestantism had never existed, and that Catholics could uphold and preserve these, even though religion should have been left unaltered, and that persons may enjoy just as much civil liberty in San Marino, as in Hanover, or in Prussia, and that children could be as well and as universally educated in Austria, as they are in England.

Whilst we were thus ruminating, we cast our eyes upon an Irish paper which had been just brought from the post office, and they fell upon an article on education, which will be found upon our columns. We read it, and as we have been in England, and it corresponded with our recollections, or delusions if you will, we gave it insertion.

Continuing our train of thought, as soon as the devil of the office had carried off the extract, we felt often and how proudly some of our fanciful boys had pointed out the superiority of England. How great, how glorious, how learned, how wise, how free, how victorious, how happy were her people? Because, during two centuries and upwards she had flung away the "Romish yoke"—and they were an educated, because a Protestant people.

This, to be sure, is admirably sustained by the article from Belfast!!! We then recollected that some persons engaged in observations on the several countries of Europe, respecting their Hospitals, had given comparative views of those which have houses for the deranged—and that the largest number were not found in Catholic countries, and that especially under the head of religious and melancholy madness the disproportion was very great; so that in the Catholic countries it was exceedingly small in comparison with others, and an Evangelical writer assigned as a cause, that with Protestants and especially with pious Protestants the subject was one of great importance, it occupied their thoughts deeply and intensely; with Catholics it was a subject of comparatively light concern, they cared little for it, and it seldom cracked their brains.

We thought the effort at a solution more ingenious and more fanciful than true. But in turning over our papers, a good sound Presbyterian journal of the new school was the next that we picked up, and it contained the following article:—

"Number of Lunatics in England.—According to Parliamentary returns, says Sir W. Ellis, 'there are in England 12,668 pauper lunatics: and the insane alone, including the different classes of society, cannot be estimated at fewer than 10,000;

that is to say, about one person in every twelve hundred.' This is a fearful view of the religious, moral, and material civilization of this country.''

NEW YORK COMMON SCHOOL FUND

We this day insert the addresses made by Bishop Hughes and the Very Reverend Doctor Power to an adjourned meeting of the Catholics of New York, on the subject of the recent decision of the city council respecting the right of the Catholics to a share of this fund. Both addresses are worthy of the orators; each is excellent in its kind. For our own parts, we were not disappointed by the result of the application to the council. Indeed we expected nothing else. We write deliberately when we state that, probably, there is not a town or city council in the United States that would not have decided in the same way. Do we then think the decision just? No. Do we think the council dishonest? That is not the ground of our opinion. What then is it? We do not think it likely that a public body can be found in the United States which does not, without its own consciousness or suspicion, think and act under the influence of great prejudice against Catholics, their claims. their rights, their principles, their religion, and their politics. Nor is it strange that such would be the case.

What are the influences under which the great bulk of our fellow-citizens have been educated? Those of English literature, which is calculated to vilify the Catholics, to whom the English nation was unjust and cruel, and whom it sought to vilify in order that it might save its own character from the imputations of injustice and of cruelty. Our fellow-citizens were educated under the influence of principles which are called liberal, and whose liberality consists in destroying all the distinctions between religious truth and religious error, of men who turned all the force of their ridicule against the Catholic Church for its efforts to preserve those distinctions.

They were educated under the influence of tyros in history, who imbibed all their knowledge from modern essayists and reviewers, and from garbled compilations; all employed or interested to misrepresent the events in which they whom Catholics respect were the heroes or the victims. Neither they nor their teachers were accustomed to view either Catholics or their religion as friendly to liberty, as lovers of learning, as promoters of industry, or as patrons of science. And hence they regarded it a mighty condescension to tolerate a Catholic in their presence; it was a vast concession, to smile upon him with anything approach-

ing to approval. We could easily amplify on this subject, but neither our space nor our time will permit us.

We may then ask, after their escape from school or from college, what was the religious influence under which our fellow-citizens were placed? Were they led to infidelity, the Catholic was the despised of the despised in their estimation! Did they get religion? The Catholic was the object of pity for his blindness, if not of execration for his connexion with anti-Christ and the beast. Thus, at this day, the Catholic stands in these republics as a Paria in the midst of the Bramins.

Nor is this all! The very harlots of the land have been hired, by the most popular teachers of religion, to write monstrous libels, or to lend their names to the reverend compilers of these edifying mirrors of modesty, that the best and the purest of the Catholic institutions should be accused of the foulest of crimes; and the very matrons of our country placed the filthy productions in the hands of their daughters; and the very devotees of charity slid quietly into the schools of the children, to imbue their minds, noiselessly, with the contamination.

Thus did the holy men who spoke in the name of God denounce Catholics as a pestilence; and they who were, and they who pretended to be, the lovers of our country and of its institutions, denounced them as the enemies of liberty; the aristocrat proclaimed their base servility, the democrat declaimed against their tyranny. The Catholics thus were made the raw-head and bloody bones of the nursery, the spectres of the schools, the scare-crows of the fields, the theme of the college undergraduates; and on the day of commencement they figured in the group with Luther, the Reformation, the mariner's compass, the printing press, and the blow-pipe: they were the execration of the godly, the abomination of the pious, the stump for the elevation of the political spouter, and the Jonas whom the political rogue cast overboard, to still the agitation which threatened his ruin.

He who has observed the features of our public character, for the last quarter of a century, will perceive in this hasty sketch nothing that is overcharged.

It is, therefore, that we said that the Catholic cannot expect justice from any public body in this country, because every such body is more or less under the influence of that prejudice which we have so imperfectly described. What else can account for the injustice of Massachusetts, the bigotry of Boston, the criminality of its public courts of justice, the gross indecency of the very best and most fitting representative of Charlestown, and the absence of all sense of shame as well as of equity

in her Legislature? Do we then despair?[22] —God forbid!—No: we rejoice; and we feel now the influence of a reasonable hope, because the Catholics have been at length made sensible of their position; and before long their proper exertions will be directed to remedy the evils under which they have been so long overwhelmed.

They have tongues, they have pens: let them be used, not to vilify others, but to defend themselves; they have rights, let them be asserted. But it will require time, exertion, and patience. Let them be devoted as they should be, and truth and justice must be successful. Already the omens are favourable. Let the Catholics, and especially the Catholic young men, continue as they have begun in New York and elsewhere, and we shall have affection, and charity, and justice, succeeding to hatred, and bigotry, and oppression.

[22] The hope of Catholics in the matter of the school controversy is founded on the American sense of justice. Catholics are taxed for an article the use of which is forbidden them by the law of Conscience. The principle here involved is a fundamental principle of the American Constitution. The solution must come.—Ed.

THE JANSENIST SCHISM

[The following is extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* No. 3, of Vol. VI., for 1826.]

One of the most mischievous modes of assuming the appearance of a virtue which is not possessed, is pretty usual amongst a particular class of European governments: one or two specimens of the practice properly explained, will do more to give our readers a full view of the hypocritical impiety than any general description could effect. We shall take the new kingdom of the Netherlands as an example.

Formerly, that portion which was known by the name Flanders, was one of the most industrious, virtuous, peaceful, and contented sections of Europe. It was, we may say, altogether Catholic, and a more zealous, laborious, well-informed, and moral clergy was nowhere found than in Belgium. The education of this clergy was conducted principally in the diocesan seminaries, under the view of the bishop and his principal clergy; and after many bequests had been made, and subscriptions given for the purpose of having those seminaries permanently and properly supported; and after they had been raised under the sanction of the laws, like our chartered seminaries, they were considered property consecrated under the guardianship of the government to the purposes for which it had been bestowed. Besides the seminaries for the education of the clergy, there were a vast number of elementary schools under the care of men who had devoted themselves to teach religion and literature, not for worldly recompense, but from the higher motives of doing service to their neighbours and to society, that for this disinterested charity they might through the merits of Christ be acceptable to their heavenly Father.

Not a complaint was heard; all was peace, harmony, and good will, education was diffused and universal. But, lo!—his Orange Majesty is advised that it would be better to establish one philosophical school at Brussels, than to have so many philosophical schools in the several dioceses: and he commands that for the promotion of literature, no student shall be admitted to a theology class until after he shall have spent three years in this college of Brussels: also, that the masters who teach in the different elementary schools shall be expelled to make room for a new

race of teachers to be sent from model schools in Brussels. This wears a very beautiful appearance until it is closely examined. The true object is found to be under the pretext of promoting literature, to prevent any religious instruction. It was originally a plan of the infidel Joseph II., of Germany. But it has been resisted; and the liberal friends of education exclaim, "How the clergy are always opposed to science!"

It would be, indeed, a very arbitrary attempt of the Legislature of New Jersey, to declare that no young man should be admitted to study theology at Princeton, until after he should have graduated at Transylvania. But it would be still worse if the Congress were to seize upon the revenues of the Baptist college, in the federal district, and give them to the Jesuits of Georgetown. Our constitution would not authorize such plunder. The moneys collected by the several denominations are secured for their own purposes; and no person thinks of a possibility of plundering our seminaries for the benefit of literature. Not so, however, his Dutch Majesty. He has stripped the Episcopal seminaries of their property, in order to endow the Philosophical College, and seized upon the funds of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, in order to bestow them upon teachers who are to unteach what they have taught, and to inform the children that the good people who left money for their education, were fools and fanatics.

BRUSSELS

"The Brothers of the Christian Doctrine have lately been expelled from the diocess of Namur, and all the small Episcopal seminaries have been closed throughout the Low Countries and Holland. The whole of the Catholic clergy, consisting of the Prince Archbishop of Malines, the Bishop of Namur, the Grand Vicars of Ghent, of Tournay, and of Liege, the Vicar Apostolic of Bois-le-Duc, and of Breda, the superior of the Dutch missions, the seven archpriests of the Northern Provinces, have addressed the king in strong, but respectful representations, to which nothing more than short and insignificant answers have been returned. Many zealous clergymen had bought and endowed houses, in which they educate young men for the priesthood; these schools also, which were very numerous, have all been destroyed. The new philosophical college at Brussels is nearly completed, and will soon be opened for the reception of students.

"In the last report of the British and Foreign School Society, the committee congratulates itself upon the success of its labours in the Low Countries. Two large schools are in full activity at Brussels, and the

king and the Prince of Orange are both declared to be favourable to the system of mutual instruction."

This last paragraph lets in much light upon the subject. Our good friends in England, having plundered the Catholic establishments of Great Britain and Ireland of what their pious ancestors had left for the purposes of religion and of literature, are training up some of the puppets of royalty, whom the unholy alliance of Europe has created to imitate their example. Yet, these are the men of liberality, the friends of literature and science! We defy France, Spain, or America to exhibit such proofs of attachment to virtue and knowledge, as to commit plunder for their sake.

The following document cannot be well understood without a few previous remarks.

Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, died in 1638, leaving after him an unpublished work upon the doctrine of St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who died in 431:—the object of this was to explain the doctrine of grace, predestination, free-will, and so forth. When the book was published, it was found to contain five propositions which did not accord with the doctrine of St. Augustine, which was that of the Catholic church. The book was of course condemned; but two questions arose—1st, whether Jansenius held this erroneous doctrine himself—2d, whether this erroneous doctrine was really contained in this book. Upon the first question each individual was free to think as he pleased; the deceased could not now speak for himself, but he had left a codicil, declaring that he submitted all his writings to the judgment of the church. Thus it was at least charitable, if not just to say that he was not a heretic, though his works did contain erroneous doctrines. Respecting the second question, several persons who admitted the propositions to be erroneous, contended that in fact they were not in the work of Jansenius, and refused to subscribe the condemnation of the work, or to publish the papal bulls of its condemnation. The whole Catholic world declared their act improper, and their position untenable, as they refused to conform to the judgment of the Catholic church, declaring that this book contained erroneous doctrine. They became schismatics, having been separated by their obstinacy from the unity of the church. They were known by the name of Jansenists.

The Bishops of Utrecht have continued the ordination of clergy, and always consecrated another bishop, so as to preserve the succession. They claim to belong to the church, and always send letters of communion to the Pope as its head, but have never condemned the work of Jansenius—and the Pope always answers by excommunication, until

they shall admit the proper principle, and do as all the other churches have done.

The King of the Netherlands, who swore to preserve the rights of his Catholic subjects, attempted several usurpations of their rights, and especially in the appointment of bishops—and finding that he was resisted by Rome, and by the Catholic people, he has been liberal enough to place in Catholic sees a number of Jansenists, who have been consecrated: one of them, William Vet, was consecrated for the see of Deventer. Thus under the private influence of others, and of his own good will—the king of the Netherlands is liberally proceeding to observe his oath, very liberally construed.

"The brief of his present holiness, which has appeared against the Bishop of Deventer, and which has so highly offended the editors of the French liberal journals, is as follows:—

"Leo XI., Pope. Health and apostolic benediction. The Catholic church has, for a long time past, been troubled by the schism of Utrecht. What have not our predecessors, the Sovereign Pointiffs, done to remedy this pernicious evil? But by an impenetrable judgment of God, they have been able, neither by their salutary advice, nor by their affectionate exhortations, nor in fine, by their threats, and the application of canonical censure, to bring back the blind to the bosom of their mother, the holy church.

"William Vet, who dares to call himself the bishop of Deventer, and has not blushed to inform us of his election, and of his consecration, in a letter which he wrote to us on the 13th of last June, has recently given new proof of his great obstinacy.

"His letter, it is true, is filled with honey, and announces a respect and obedience toward us; but this very letter teaches us in what light we ought to hold his pretended and worn-out flatteries; for William there shows himself engaged in the same errors, opposed with the same obstinacy to the holy canons, and in a word sullied with all the filth, which his fellows, from the very beginning of the Schismatics of Utrecht, have covered themselves. William, nevertheless, fears not to represent them, as full of innocence and free from all blame, and even to extol them highly. Since then, William differs in nothing from those whom our predecessors thought necessary to treat with severity, after exhausting the resources of their paternal tenderness; we, walking in their esteemed footsteps, have determined to make him feel the same censures; for we would not, dearest children, that any one of you, in the midst of whom the schism of Utrecht insinuates itself, and grievously devours souls, deceived by the delusion of these cheats, should follow, as good shep-

herds, and permit yourselves to be taken by the deceitful voice of wolves, who cover themselves with the skins of sheep, to desolate, destroy, and massacre, more easily the flock. Therefore, we decry, in virtue of the apostolic authority with which we are clothed; and we declare that the election of William Vet to the bishopric of Deventer is illegal, vain, null, and his consecration illegitimate, and sacrilegious. We excommunicate and anathematize the above-named William, and all those who took any part in his culpable election, and who have concurred by their power, their endeavours, and their consent and advice, either to his election or his consecration. We decide, decree, and declare, that they are separated from the communion of the Church as schismatics, and that they ought to be avoided. And moreover the said William is suspended from the exercise of the rights and functions belonging to the jurisdiction or to the order of bishops, and we interdict him under pain of incurring excommunication by the deed itself, and without any declaration, from making the holy chrism, from conferring the sacrament of confirmation, from giving orders, or from doing any of the acts reserved to the order of bishops, declaring them moreover vain, useless, of no value, and of no importance, all, and each of the acts which he shall have the boldness to perform.

"Let those who have received ecclesiastical order from him know that they are bound by this suspension, and that they will become irregular, if they shall have exercised the functions of the order which they have received.

"'Tis with regret and with great grief that we impose these censures upon the guilty. Oh! if they were stricken and plagued in grief by our decree; if they should weep and repent, how great would not be our joy? What tears of joy a conversion so desirable would draw from our eyes! With what transports should we fold in our arms children returning to their father! How great would be our thanks to the God of mercy! We entreat him daily by ardent prayers, that he would deign to bestow this consolation upon us and upon the church. Do you do the same, our dearest children, you of whom we know, and so justly praise the invincible faith, and the indestructible union with the Holy See, the centre of orthodox unity.

"To assist you to satisfy more willingly, more fully, and with more joy this duty of evangelic charity, we give you affectionately the apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at the Church of St. Peter, under the Fishermen's Seal, on the nineteenth day of August, 1825, second year of our Pontificate."

EPISODE OF MR. WARD AND MR. POINSETT

[The following piece, which appeared as an editorial article in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, No. 2, of Vol. VI., for 1826, will have a special interest for the citizens of South Carolina, as preserving the memory of an incident in the public life of one of her greatest statesmen; a man who has shown himself a hero in action, as well as in words, and who, like all really brave men, has never been ashamed to avow his sympathy for the injured and oppressed.]

The *Patriot*, which is published in this city, contained the following article, on the evening of Friday, the 21st inst.:

"We have seen a letter from Mexico, under date of the 25th of May, which states that there is every probability of Mr. Poinsett soon being successful in concluding a commercial treaty between Mexico and this country, favourable to our interests. We have been informed also, that at a public dinner, given on St. Patrick's day, in the city of Mexico, on Mr. Poinsett's expressing a wish for the emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland, he was warmly replied to by Mr. Ward, the British Chargé des Affaires, who defended the policy of his government, to which Mr. Poinsett replied with calmness and courtesy, and was heartily cheered both by the natives and the British subjects present. We are beside given to understand that the Executive Council of Mexico was strongly inclined to fit out an expedition against Cuba, which had met with the concurrence of the Senate, but the proposition was rejected by the popular branch of the Legislature."

So far as Mr. Poinsett is concerned, he has acted as we should expect, as well from our knowledge of him as a friend to public liberty; as particularly, from the very just notions which we know he entertains on Irish affairs.

We not only are attached by many ties to South Carolina, and love Charleston, but we respect the talent, the virtue, and the chivalrous honour of those who move in the van of our fellow-citizens. Shall we, therefore, say that on every subject they are well informed, and think correctly? No indeed, we cannot! but this is no reproach to them, it is but the evidence that they are human beings, and not gifted with the perfection of the Deity; there is no place whose inhabitants know everything, and are free from all delusion, and exempt from every bias.

The people of South Carolina know very little of the true state of Ireland, and are only acquiring the rudiments of knowledge, respecting the actual state of oppression, under which the unfortunate Irish Catholic labours in the land of his birth. Gentlemen in the city of Charles-

ton, whose acquirements are very great, whose reading is very extensive, and whose dispositions are excellent, still know absolutely nothing of the thraldom and degradation in which the British government keeps the Irish Catholic, and yet, his present degradation is lenity—is mercy—compared to what his ancestors have endured. Greece meets, at least, with sympathy, even some little aid is extended to her.

But though New York and Baltimore and Washington have transmitted their sighs and aspirations and blessings upon the western breeze, and Ireland has been refreshed and consoled by the soothing zephyr, still no soul appears amongst us to be touched by the melancholy sound of the dishonoured harp. 'Tis true our excellent attorney-general, Mr. Pettigru, has, on the 4th of July, 1825, poured the history of Ireland's wo into the ears of a Charleston assembly.

'Tis true, the passing glow of indignation mantled upon the cheek of the one sex, and made the darkened brow lower over the fixed eye of the other, whilst hands unconsciously sought for some warrior's weapon. This gave evidence that virtuous sympathy existed in the South; and that if the public mind had been correctly informed, the public feeling would have been appropriately manifested, and the public energies successfully directed. But we repeat, the public mind is not sufficiently informed, and here is to be found the true cause of Southern apathy. Why it is not informed, is easily answered. Because to admire Ireland is not fashionable. Greece!—why the very word is magic—classic recollections are associates with the very sound—the names of her early warriors of her venerable sages—all, all are repeated almost by every person who can lisp. They are, like the Greek sentence of Mr. Jenkinson in the Vicar of Wakefield, a talismanic expression, which astounds the vulgar, confers dignity on the utterer, makes the unlearned humbly dumb, teaches caution to the half instructed, and makes those who are truly erudite silent for a different reason; thus leaving him who has the courage to fling forth such amalgamated, stupendous, polysyllabic phraseology, sole possessor of the admiration of his audience. But alas for poor Ireland! how adverse has been her destiny? We shall not now advert to the cause—another time may be more appropriate. She has been made a byword of reproach. That she ever had sages! that she ever had warriors! that any of her sons were philosophers! that the name of an Irishman was not barbarous. Ridiculous!!! Who could listen to such assertions? The whole testimony of English historians, the frequent rebellions of the turbulent, wild Irish, and the acknowledged ignorance of their illiterate clergy who prevent the people from learning,—all establish the fact of Irish barbarity. The stage, the press, the pulpit,

and the senate, proclaim their degradation. Thus, while every scrap regarding Greece interests the fashionable world, it would be evidence of bad taste to take any interest in what concerns Ireland, and especially Irish Catholics. The cause of that ignorance of which we complain is, in the first place, that it has been made unfashionable to be interested for Ireland. We shall, before we conclude this article, exhibit another cause, far worse in its nature, but not more injurious in its results.

Mr. Poinsett is one of the very few with whom we have conversed, who has had the manliness to disengage himself from the trammels of this debasing fashion. We call that debasing which perpetuates ignorance. We have found that his travels have been turned to much better account than those of other gentlemen, whose opportunities were equally good and extensive.

They viewed novelties with prejudice, and either sought no explanation, or sought it from an enemy of what they saw; and thus the original prejudice became almost incurably fixed, and far more deeply tinged. We have frequently lamented the ruin of fine minds, and of good dispositions, from this cause. Mr. Poinsett appeared to us to have sought to understand what he saw, and to have had recourse to those means of information which were best calculated to give him correct knowledge, and hence it seemed to us that he had very accurate notions upon many subjects not generally canvassed here.

Amongst those subjects was the state of Ireland, and of its state the case of the Catholic population was a peculiar feature. Hence we were fully convinced, that if he was ever called upon to speak upon that subject, he would have done so with effect; and we feel satisfied that whoever Mr. Ward may be, he must deeply regret having provoked the retort that it seems he has earned and received.

We now come to another part of our subject. Though we are about to use a very severe term, we do it with full deliberation, believing that the term is too mild for the crime. The conduct of the British government towards the Irish Catholic is so execrable, that no person could for one instant attempt to vindicate or even to palliate it, unless by showing that its victims were so criminal that their depravity required this extraordinary infliction: that they were so dangerous to society, that its well-being demanded their political incarceration. Hence, of necessity, it became part of the duty of British policy to criminate the Irish Catholics. A crimination of mere Irishmen would not, at present, be sufficient, as it would formerly have been. Before the change in religion made by Henry VIII., the English colony in Ireland oppressed the mere Irish. Then it became necessary to destroy the Irish character, that English

oppression might be justified. Every Irishman then was said to have had every bad quality. But when Henry and Elizabeth and James procured some few of these bad Irish to become of the new religion, the depravity of the Irish character was purged away by the merits of the adopted creed. All the rebellious remnant who obstinately followed in the way of their fathers, were now the outcasts, possessing the quality of Irishmen in common with their regenerated brethren. To attribute to that quality of mere Irishmen the inherent corruption, would be to discredit those mere Irish who had been received into the society of the reformed. But, as the quality of Catholicism was peculiar to the outcasts, it at the same time saved the credit of those who had changed, and it left the blot upon those whom they had [deserted] to attribute now to religion, what was before attributed to soil. Thus, the faults were now charged to Catholics. But still, as the majority of the people remained attached to their ancient faith, Ireland was with the multitude, and not with the exception. Thus, every English writer was bound to prove that Irish Catholics deserved the punishments under which they groaned, and of the two qualities, that of Catholicism, which was peculiar to the oppressed, was vilified the most. A dreadful remnant of the barbarous code yet exists, and it is the duty of every British servant to attempt the justification of the government by which he is paid. To justify that government, he must vilify the Irish Catholic. It was very natural for Mr. Ward to feel mortified when Mr. Poinsett expressed a wish that justice should be done to a people whom the king, Mr. Ward's master, persecuted. But it was equally natural that Mr. Poinsett, with the principles and feelings which he possesses, should express the wish of emancipation, a wish perfectly congenial to the principles of the nation which he has the honour to represent. Mr. Ward might have expressed his regret, as Mr. Canning would, or as many others would, that his government had not found it as yet expedient to do justice to the people of Ireland, together with a hope that this expedient time would arrive some day, before the wreck of his empire would alone remain. But, no; this would not satisfy his ardent zeal, and when he sought to justify what is unjustifiable in the presence of our minister, he reckoned without his host.

We feel that we have extended this article too far. We shall for this day conclude with returning our thanks to Mr. Poinsett, and expressing our conviction that the Irish Catholic citizens of America unite with us in the expression.

THE BRITISH PRESS [23]

Is not ashamed of the persecution of the Catholics, but is ashamed and angry that the misdeeds of its persecuting government should be known. That government has too long been successful in deceiving foreign nations; but the delusion is about to be destroyed. The *National Gazette* of the 19th contains the following article concerning which we had made some previous remarks.

May God bless Mr. Poinsett! The Irish and the sons of the Irish, the Catholics and the sons of the Catholics, will recollect his manly conduct. They are not ungrateful. They have clear vision and good memory, as well as warm hearts.

We find the following article in the *London Courier* of the 12th ult.: [24]

"We copied a few days since, from an American paper, the following paragraph:

" 'At a public dinner given on St. Patrick's day in the city of Mexico, on Mr. Poinsett, our minister, expressing a wish for the emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland, he was warmly replied to by Mr. Ward, the British Chargé d'Affaires, who defended the policy of his government; to which Mr. Poinsett replied with calmness and courtesy, and was heartily cheered by the natives and the British subjects present.'

"A gentleman who is now in this country, and who has distinguished himself both in the political and military affairs of Mexico, writes to us thus upon the above paragraph:

" 'I was not only present, but almost close to Mr. Poinsett, at the time, and the real case was exactly the reverse of the statement. Mr. Poinsett committed himself most grossly, and Mr. Ward's conduct was most proper and gentlemanly. Such being the case, whether you will consider that any further notice of the subject ought to be taken or not, you alone can decide; but I really think the *amende honorable* is due to Mr. Ward, who merely resented a most improper interference on the part of an intriguing foreign envoy, in affairs exclusively British.' "

On the subject thus mentioned in the *Courier*, a communication from a very respectable American in Mexico has been in our hands for some months. The foregoing British statement seems to require its immediate publication, and we therefore annex it, in the belief that it will have all authority, in this country, at least, where Mr. Poinsett is too well known to be supposed to have "committed himself grossly,"

[23] From the *Catholic Miscellany* of October 28, 1826.
[24] From the *National Gazette.*

and been guilty of "an improper interference in affairs exclusively British."

"Mexico, March 31st, 1826.

"*Dear Sir*:—An occurrence lately took place here, of which I deem it proper that you should be in possession of the particulars, not that there is any necessity they should be published now, nor is it desirable,—but as this matter has already made some noise here, and as misrepresentations may find the way into our press, I am anxious you should have the means of correcting them, should they be made, and beg you to do so.

"Mr. Poinsett and myself were invited by the Irish gentlemen in this city to partake of a dinner on the day before yesterday, given in celebration of St. Patrick's day. There were eighty or ninety persons at table, of which at least four-fifths were English. A toast was given highly complimentary to the United States, and was received with applause and enthusiasm. Mr. Poinsett feeling himself called upon to reply, immediately expressed himself as follows:

" 'The generous sentiments which dictated this toast are neither new to me nor unexpected. The sons of St. Patrick have been long known to me. They are to be found in the land which has been emphatically and truly called "the land of the free," amongst our most useful and distinguished citizens. I have lived with many of them on terms of intimate friendship, and have learned to appreciate their worth. The interest with which the Irish nation has inspired me—an interest growing out of their frank, and generous, and manly character—induces me to indulge a hope that the day is not far distant when the Irish Catholics will be placed in the full enjoyment of the same civil and religious rights which are enjoyed by all others of their fellow-subjects, and to which their many noble qualities so eminently entitle them. In uttering this wish, I do but echo the sentiments of most liberal and enlightened statesmen of Great Britain, who have laboured to produce this important and desirable result. It is indeed a consummation devoutly to be wished. And while I return you my most sincere thanks for the sentiments contained in the toast just given, and for the cordial manner in which it was received, I beg leave to express a hope, that the sons of St. Patrick, whether they dwell in the bosom of their native country, or in a foreign land, in Europe or in America, may enjoy the inestimable blessing of civil and religious liberty.'

"These sentiments were received with loud and long-continued applause. After the lapse of fifteen or twenty minutes, Mr. Ward, the British Chargé d'Affaires, when he was about to retire, together with the

ministers of this government, remarked, 'that he regretted that the only subject upon which a difference of feeling and opinion could exist among the company had been touched upon; and that he was much surprised at it, as it had been previously understood and agreed, that no allusion should be made to that subject on the present occasion. But that as the topic in question had been introduced, he felt himself bound, as the representative of the British government, to say that he heartily wished to the Irish people the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, so far as might be consistent with the safety of the present dynasty of Great Britain.' These observations were made under the influence of a visible and rather violent excitement.

"Mr. Poinsett, astonished that his remarks should have thus roused H. B. M.'s representative, disclaimed any intention of giving offence, and said, that if the agreement the gentleman mentioned had been made, with respect to the subject of the Irish Catholic emancipation, he had not been informed of it; but that as such was the case, he was sorry he had touched the subject: that, however, having done so, he could but repeat, that the sentiments he had expressed were sincerely felt by him, and he believed by the most enlightened and liberal of the statesmen and people of Great Britain.

"Mr. Ward then stated, that he felt not in the least degree offended at what had been stated; but that as the representative of H. B. M. he had deemed it his duty to express himself as he had done. He then withdrew, together with the ministers of this government, who witnessed this singular scene, and who can hardly, I should think, have derived impressions from it very favourable to his B. M.'s envoy or government.

"Mr. Poinsett was about to take his leave also, when he was earnestly requested by the president of the day to remain. That officer then expressed to him, in the most cordial and handsome manner, his thanks and those of the company for the sentiments he had expressed, and declared his and their entire approbation of them,—which declaration was ratified by loud applause from the whole table. Mr. Poinsett then again addressed the company, expressed his regret that the harmony of the evening had been interrupted by anything which had fallen from him, and said that he would avail himself of the present occasion to declare that he had no wish whatever to injure the British interests in this country, and had never taken any measures with that view, though he was fully aware that such measures had been imputed to him; that he came here, and was here, to support the interests of his own country, but that he sincerely believed those interests clashed in no way with the interests of Great Britain; on the contrary, he believed them to be in

perfect harmony; that the Uinted States asked not, nor would they accept, any exclusive privilege; and that he would most cheerfully and cordially co-operate with the agents, subjects of H. B. M., here, towards the establishment, in this country, of the most liberal principles of trade, politics, and religion.

"I cannot close this communication without stating that these occurrences were suppressed in the account of the dinner published here, by Mr. Poinsett's interference, and at the urgent request of the Irish committee. I send you the Aguila containing the account. This statement of the affair I vouch for, as it passed in my presence."

CATHOLIC SUPERSTITION

[The ensuing piece, concerning the fable of St. Patrick's Purgatory and some other foolish inventions of the Protestant press, is extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* No. 10, of Vol. XX., for 1840.]

SHAMEFUL

It is with great reluctance and pain that we prefix this title to the present article. When a periodical publication like the *Gospel Messenger,* of this city, gives insertion to an extract such as the following, without any qualifiying remark of its own, it may be fairly inferred that its editors intended to convey to their readers the idea of the truth of its assertions. We copy it from the number for the month of September, which has been issued during the present week.—page 273.

ON HUMAN CREDULITY

Referring to the Mahometan pilgrimage, called Hadj, the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1830, says:

"That a semi-barbarous set of people should believe in the effcacy of this Hadj, is not in the least surprising—not half so much so, as that in enlightened Germany, at this hour, there should be found believers, persons of high rank and station too, in the miraculous performances of Prince Hohenlohe. There is no rational account to be given as to the extent of human credulity; and we see no good reason why a Mussulman should not believe, as he is in duty bound to, that Mahomet was conducted from Mecca to Jerusalem, and ascended from thence into the seventh heaven, under the guidance of Gabriel, and came back to his bed in the same night, as readily as a good Catholic believes, as his church demands, in the flight of the chapel of Loretto; or that the statues of saints and angels take a walk on particular occasions from one church to another, which everybody knows frequently happens. At this moment, there is a regular Hadj, performed every year by, on an average, some twelve or thirteen hundred thousand of our own poor, ignorant Irish peasantry, to that scene of miserable imposture and quackery, in the north of their island, known by the name of St. Patrick's Purgatory; and as Mecca is visited by pilgrims from Morocco and

Cabul, so is this Catholic Kaaba by true believers from the utmost recesses of Maryland."

The mode of arranging extracts for such a publication requires some little tact; every one in the least degree conversant with editorial duties is so fully aware of this, that the object of the publisher may be generally inferred from the order of his pieces. The extract which precedes that which we have just given, is "On Clerical Usefulness," exhibiting the parsons of the English Protestant Church, as enlightened men who preserve and extend the mental cultivation of their parishes. The reader will then naturally feel contempt for the besotted dupes of the Catholic Church described in the succeeding extract which we have copied, and if he believes the statement correct, it is natural that he should.

We now ask the publishers of those paragraphs, if these be correct delineations of the Catholic doctrine and practices, why do they not discover them amongst the Catholics who are in their own vicinity? Why are they under the necessity of going to foreign countries to depict the features which they have at home and at their doors? Shall we tell them that it is because of their consciousness that the experiment could not be made with safety here? Shall we be permitted to say that any effort of the sort would be detected by an inquisitive and intelligent people upon the spot? And the honesty of a candid public would cause the libellers of any portion of their fellow-citizens to feel the consequences of their misconduct? Yet the Catholic religion here is the same that it is abroad. In this city, within the last half year, the Catholic bishop has published his report, together with the evidence upon which it was founded, regarding one of the "miraculous performances of Prince Hohenlohe," as the paragraph styles it. It has been advertised, —many copies of it have been sold. We shall send one, free of charge, to the publisher of the *Gospel Messenger*. Will the copyist of the miserable article of which we complain refute its statements, or disprove its conclusions? This would be a more open, a more manly, and a more respectable course for them to pursue, than to fly to the sneers of their brethren in Europe, from what they can lay their hands upon and try their skill upon at home.

The writers for the *Quarterly Review*, and they for the *Gospel Messenger*, have undertaken to instruct others respecting that belief which the Catholic Church demands from all good members of her communion. They state, that "a good Catholic readily believes as his church demands, in the flight of the chapel of Loretto." If the good gentlemen really imagine either that such belief is essential to constitute

a good Catholic, or that the church demands such belief, they are egregiously in error. The church requires no belief whatever, respecting the alleged occurrence—neither can any Catholic make it an article of his faith, nor is he bound to form any opinion thereon.

The same is the case regarding the statues of saints and angels, which the writers state, "take a walk on particular occasions from one church to another;" of course, if "everybody knows that this happens frequently," it must be true. However, upon this we have less information than those writers seem to possess. And they not only appear to know what is, but also that which is not the faith. Now we presume that our humble selves and sundry other Catholics, to the amount of many thousands whom we know, will require to be included as a "part and parcel" in the composition of everybody, and yet strange to say!—they and we really are acquainted with very many statues of saints and angels, amongst which, neither of us could ever discover one that possessed this ambulatory disposition, neither are we assured that any such statue does or did exist, nor does the church demand of us nor of any one of us, to believe that such is the fact. Now if these writers sincerely think, as they repeatedly publish, they are shamefully ignorant of the tenets of the Catholic Church; and on the other side, if they do know what our doctrines really are, they are more shamefully guilty.

As to the Hadj scene of miserable imposture and quackery to which twelve or thirteen hundred thousand of the poor ignorant Irish peasantry, appear yearly addicted. We shall for a moment suppose it to be a fact that such a pilgrimage is performed. We ask, if such be the fact, who are accountable for the alleged superstitions of St. Patrick's purgatory in Lough Dearg?—Of course the Catholic Church, and the Catholic clergy, are accountable for the iniquities of this "Catholic Kaaba."

Let us examine upon what principle. We must acquit them, unless we find them guilty of establishing what they subvert, exhorting to what they condemn, and encouraging what they have used their best efforts to dissuade from, and to abolish.

We shall not advert to the uniform exertions of the Catholic prelacy of Ireland and of their clergy, within our own knowledge, to obliterate any traces of a superstition which once had a limited prevalence in respect to this place—neither shall we go to earlier documents than those which the editors of the *Gospel Messenger* themselves may read at the library of the seminary in this city. The librarian will there show them, if they please to examine, under the head *Purgatorium*, in the *Dictionary*

of Ferrari, Volume vii. page 227, column ii. notes in margin 24, several condemnations of the superstition by the authority of the Catholic Church, of which the following are specimens.—In Venice, in the year 1522, before the existence of an English Protestant, when all Ireland was Catholic, an edition of the Breviary was printed by Antonio de Giunta, in which legends commendatory of this pilgrimage were inserted; they were erased by the Pope's orders, and two years after, the same de Giunta published his edition revised without them; and an order was made at Rome, prohibiting any republication of the suppressed legendary. Nearly thirty years before, in the pontificate of Alexander VI., who died about fifteen years before Luther began to dogmatize, at a period when all English and Irish were Catholics—the Bollandists inform us that an order was issued at Rome by this Pope to have the cave to which these pilgrimages were made closed up, and to prevent its being resorted to; because of the fables related of the place, and superstitions practised there. Thus it is clear that Rome is not accountable for these superstitions if they still exist.[25] Any person who is acquainted with the history of Ireland for some centuries previous to this period, will be at no loss to point out the causes of the decay of the ancient and holy discipline; and to trace the effects of British cruelty, rapine, and perfidy. They who know the subsequent history of the Irish Church will easily perceive how impossible it was for a hunted, persecuted, and almost extirminated hierarchy to enforce restrictive discipline upon a race who, for their attachment to the faith, endured worse than Egyptian bondage, added to more than the persecutions of imperial Rome. But all this notwithstanding; the evil has been seriously diminished, and we may well say, has been altogether removed, though several persons still visit the place as an object of curiosity—and many who feel themselves excited to devotion, pray there and in the vicinity with sincere piety, whilst we do fear that even as yet there may be sometimes, though seldom, found amongst individuals some remnant of that superstition, which was introduced in days of that ruinous oppression and unprincipled confiscation which destroyed religion in the ravages of civil strife. But be it remembered that the remedy was applied ere Protestantism began, and it was rendered nearly inefficacious

[25] The vital logical mistake made by Protestants in passing judgment on Catholics consists mainly in their failure to distinguish between the Church and individuals in the Church. Neither the Pope, nor the bishops, nor the priests constitute the Church. The Church is not merely a divinely constituted authority—not simply an aggregation of individuals. It is more than a splendidly organized force. It is an organism with its principle of growth from within. The Pope and the bishops and the priests are but the officials. They are the organs of the organism. It is neither honest nor logical to attribute to the Church the faults of individuals.—Ed.

by those who, calling themselves reformers, prevented the timely exertion of that power which ultimately succeeded against their will.

Be it also remembered that if the Irish Catholic is poor, his poverty has been caused by the confiscation of the possessions of his ancestors, for their adherence to that faith which they received from their fathers, and by the testimony of their reason; and because they would not follow the changes of an exasperated monarch who "spared no woman in his lust, and no man in his anger;" and of a debased Parliament, that cowered at his frown, and trembled before the menace of a daughter worthy of such a sire. It ill becomes the children of the parents who obtained their wealth by the accommodation of their consciences to the new creed, to taunt with their poverty those whom the most disgraceful code that ever darkened the pages of a statute book oppressed and ground down, because they would not swear that they disbelieved what their hearts cherished, and their judgments approved. But there is a disposition in a portion of the human race to increase the zest of enjoying the booty, by taunting those from whom it was taken!

If this peasantry be ignorant; be it remembered that such ignorance was forced upon them by the men who enacted that if any person of their own church dared to give them instruction, or offered them a little learning except at the price of their creed, he should be treated as a felon. Can any conduct be more shameful than this?

It was natural just now, at the moment when the sword had been wrung from its grasp, to expect some dying groan of desperate bigotry like the above paragraph from the *Quarterly Review*, that Corypheus of the Protestant Episcopal Church united to the British crown; but if upon such considerations, it might in its present circumstances be excused, was similar indulgence to be extended to the editors of the *Gospel Messenger*, upon whom no attack has been made, who have been left undisturbed in the possession of all the benefits to which they are fully and fairly entitled by that constitution, to establish and to maintain which, the "poor ignorant Irish peasantry," or immigrants, and their sons, exhibited as much ardour, bestowed as much devotion, and poured out as copious libations of their blood upon the American soil, as did any other of the sects or sections which contended for the achievement of our liberties, from the plains of Abraham, where Montgomery fell, to the trenches of Savannah, in which Jasper composed himself to death in his Carolinian flag.

There are in this country a set of writers for the religious press, who are so notorious for the character of their productions against our church, that it is not needful to notice them. They may, as far as we

are concerned, continue such publications with impunity.—There are others, amongst which we have hitherto ranked the *Gospel Messenger*, which deservedly claimed a higher place.—We were pained, latterly, to observe that the tone of its paragraphs against our religion was approximating to that of the journals to which we have alluded. From the Protestant Episcopal press we expected no praise, we looked for no quarter; but we said to ourselves, "Its conductors are gentlemen, its readers are considered to be high-minded. We shall find mistakes, but no vulgar abuse; we shall find argument to try and confute us, but no miserable efforts to bring into disrepute those whom they cannot answer." We have been disappointed. And we beg to add, for the information of the editors, that before we place them upon our "hopeless list," they shall, if they provoke them, have a few trials.

Were we disposed to avail ourselves of every little piece of misconduct or folly of a few of the refuse of their communion, we could annoy them every week. But, God forbid that we should charge the misconduct of bad or of ignorant Protestants to the Protestant religion.

IGNORANCE OF CATHOLIC TENETS

We can easily forgive a Hindoo or a Chinese who knows nothing of our political institutions; he has had no opportunity of becoming acquainted with either their principles or details. We do not blame a Cherokee, or a Creek, or even a Catawba, if he is not able to tell the difference between a Congregationalist and a Presbyterian; but we are scarcely disposed to extend similar indulgence to the most enlightened portion of our fellow-citizens, if they will not learn of what materials another portion of that community is composed, a quarter of a million is certainly but a small section of ten millions, still it is right that the most scientific, and the most enlightened division of our fellow-citizens should know what are the principles of—we will not call them what we believe they approximate to, if they are not, half a million of the inhabitants of this Union—but of 250,000 beings who live, move, and have their being in our republic, and which little section holds the same principles as do, perhaps, more than 200,000,000 of the present inhabitants of this globe; for such is a moderate estimate of the number of Roman Catholics now in the world. And as this large body contains [by] far [the] greater number of the civilized part of mankind, their principles cannot be a matter of indifference to those who are compelled to dwell in their society. Not only are our Protestant fellow-citizens obliged to dwell along with us, but to the north they have Catholic Canada, to the south they have a vast Catholic peninsula, and to the southwest they have Catholic Mexico.

How deplorable, then, must be the situation of our Protestant fellow-citizens, if Catholics have no moral obligation to restrain them from mischief, and if no oath can bind them to any duty, or to the disclosure of truth?

We have been led to these observations by the facts which it disgusts us to observe upon; but the health of the community sometimes requires that, however offensive may be the matter, a contagious nuisance must be approached for removal. In all civilized societies lawyers are supposed to be gentlemen of information. Yet what has been the exhibition in New York? We take it from the columns of the *Truth Teller*. In the publication of August 19th, is a letter signed "Juvenis," of which the following is an extract:

"*Sir*—Catholics complain, and justly, of the misrepresentation of their religious creed. It is a subject equally misunderstood by Protestants and Dissenters in the old and new world. This is greatly to be regretted, as it not only furnishes powerful obstacles to the emancipation of the Catholic at home, but greatly increases the difficulties he has to contend with abroad. If he remains in the land of his nativity, he is enslaved; if he quits it for another, he is destined to encounter prejudices so strong as to place him, in fact, without the protection of the laws.

"I have been led into these reflections by a striking instance of the practical effect of these prejudices, in a case which lately came under my observation. A Catholic made application for the benefit of the insolvent act before one of the judges. He was opposed with great pertinacity and virulence. In confirming his own statements, and disproving the allegations of his opponents, he had occasion to examine a number of witnesses of the Catholic persuasion. In the zeal of his adversaries to defeat his application, it was urged, among other things, that no reliance was to be placed on the statement of himself or his witness; that they did not care how they testified, it being a principle of their creed that nothing more was required of them in order to the forgiveness of their sins than to confess them to their priest! If so, permit me to ask what a deep and deadly prejudice is such an opinion calculated to produce? Nothing can more effectually unnerve the arm raised for the defence of Irishmen in courts of justice. It is a too prevalent complaint among our countrymen, that they cannot procure justice when sued for in opposition to those of any other nation. And do we not here discover the cause? Can it be expected that courts and juries influenced by such an opinion can do them justice? An oath for confirmation is the end of strife; but if that oath is disbelieved, if the party making it is presumed to be guided by a belief that whether he speaks truth or falsehood he has nothing to fear, of what avail is it other than to mock justice? No range of our imagination can embrace in one view the mischievous effects of this opinion to those against whom it is entertained. It singles them out as beings dangerous to the peace of society, while it deprives them of the power of defending themselves against numerous acts of injustice which persons thus circumstanced are doomed to suffer."

Commenting upon which, in his publication of the 26th, the editor of that paper says, amongst other remarks:

"In 1620 the Puritans landed at Plymouth, bringing with them the true story of their own persecution, and the false story of Catholic enormity with which mercenary writers had stained the page of history. Their minds were tainted with the sorry prejudices matured against Roman Catholics during the reign of the virgin Elizabeth, the predecessor of the first Stuarts. They had been taught to regard them as the most idolatrous and abominable of beings, and their belief descended in all its falsity from their children's children to the present generation. Roman Catholics of any country were esteemed bad enough—but Irish Roman Catholics were regarded by them as the very worst of beings. And why this particular prejudice? Because the lying histories, and fabricated calumnies, and matchless vituperations of British authors reached them, and were implicity relied on as authentic and true, at once confirming them in their prejudices, which tradition had excited, and stigmatizing the character of the miserable Irish Catholic. But does that prejudice now exist? Look to the communication of Juvenis in our last; look into the courts of civil and criminal jurisprudence in America; look to the disposition and feeling of those who should be charitable, if nothing more, towards Irishmen, and the answer is ready. We our-

selves know of the existence of that prejudice—because we have seen its malevolence evinced before our very eyes, in many courts of justice. We have seen the book snatched from the hand of a Catholic witness, during the very administering of the oath, because it had no cross on it. We have heard the sneer of contempt as audibly on the introducing of a Catholic Irishman as a witness, as the voice of rejection or discredit could have made it. We have listened with astonishment to the interrogatories of court, counsel, and jury, when put to a Catholic under direct as well as cross examination. We have wondered again and again at their ideas with respect to that holy religion from which their fathers were apostates. They seemingly have thought, and continue still to think, that the precepts of Christianity, as taught without either looseness or vitiation by the successors of the Apostles, had and still have a direct tendency to moral depravation; that Irishmen who are Catholics are infinitely below belief, even when they are under oath, and are sensibly feeling that the wrath of an offended God awaits their want of verity. And this is the belief of those of whom "Juvenis" has spoken!—and depraved the heart must be, and corrupted must be the intellect, that would, in spite of education, give credence to such opinion. 'The man who is conscious of the rectitude of his own heart, is slow to credit another's baseness.' "

As to the idea that a Catholic does not consider the oath binding unless there be a cross marked upon the book, it is not peculiar to New York. We state, and from our knowledge of the judges and bar of Charleston, both of which we highly respect, and for many members of each of which we have sincere and ardent friendship, we regret to be obliged to state that several are so absolutely ignorant of the principles of the creed of the great bulk of the civilized world, as to imagine that we do not consider ourselves bound upon oaths unless there is a cross marked on the book of the Gospels. When we first heard that such ignorance existed in a body which ought to be enlightened, we were really incredulous; but we now know it by our own experience. This we could pass over with the mere expression of our regret that gentlemen of education should be so ignorant, and have acted upon an offensive calumny. But in another part of the state, in the District of York, an exhibition took place last year, for the correctness of our statement of which we have the authority of the learned judge who presided. A criminal was put upon his trial, and the testimony against him was conclusive; a lawyer who was engaged for the defence had the effrontery to contend that there could be no conviction, because the principal witness was not a man whose oath could be safely relied upon, for there were witnesses of undoubted veracity to prove that it was strongly suspected that the principal witness was a Roman Catholic. The learned judge reprobated in becoming terms such gross misconduct. But what is to be said of the learned gentleman who urged the objection? What a yell would ring from every printing office in the United States, if in any of our southern republics it would be urged by a learned lawyer

that a Protestant was not to be believed upon oath in the court of justice! The demoralizing influence of Popery, the gross ignorance of Papists, the outrage upon Protestant honour! ! ! We could not dare to utter one syllable in defence. But as it was only said of Catholics, the whole thing is just and right, and the lawyer is learned and liberal.

THE TERM "CATHOLIC"

[The following brief article, which was written at about the time when the Oxford Controversy was first becoming a matter of general interest in this country, is extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for March 6, 1841. It will be seen from the date, that it was written but a year and one month before the death of Bishop England; and although evidently not intended as a formal and laboured argument, it has been thought by the editors, that it might have some interest, as showing the way in which his strong and emphatically common-sense judgment threw aside, with a motion partly playful and partly indignant, that claim to a Catholicity out of the Communion of Rome, which he did not live to combat with more powerful and carefully prepared weapons.]

We have, of late, been not a little amused at some curious essays that fell under our view, in which the writers seriously undertook to show that the "nicknames" which are given to us by our friends, and by our enemies, in the several Protestant societies, are by no means "uncourteous," and that we have no reason to complain of their want of urbanity. It is said, that all the divisions of the Church of Christ form His Catholic Church; and, that to give appellation "Catholic" to one alone, would be to exclude all the others. To this we have very little to observe, beyond asking with St. Paul: "Is Christ divided?" Seriously, do our brethren say that "Antichrist" is Christ; that the "Lady of Babylon" is his pure and immaculate spouse, for which he "delivered himself up . . . . that he might present it to himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish?" We were always under the impression that the Saviour had but "one fold," under "one Shepherd;" [that] this one church was "one body, and one spirit," as there is but "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Nay, we even thought that its fidelity was to be exhibited, by all its members, so far as doctrine is concerned, "speaking the same thing, that there be no schisms among them." But it seems that we were in error;—that this was a delusion;—that the church is a conglomeration of battling disputants, excommunicating each other, denouncing each other, charging each other with destructive error, each proclaiming that the other has substituted his own delusions and mistakes for the teaching of Christ.

And this is the One Catholic Church! Be it so. It is an improve-

ment upon Christianity, effected by placing the Catholic Church somewhat in that point of view [in which] Pope St. Leo the Great, once placed pagan Rome. *Magnam existimabat se habere religionem, quia nullum respuebat errorem*, was, we think, his expression. "She esteemed herself to have great religion, because she rejecteed no error." Thus, all the errors and heresies that exist in Christendom are found in the Catholic Church of Christ!

This is a most glorious manifestation! Who, now, can deny that the discovery of the art of printing, the mariner's compass, the blowpipe, and the application of the force of steam, have each and all essentially contributed to enable men better to ascertain what Jesus Christ taught to his Apostles eighteen hundred years ago, in Judea?

Thus, in this one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, we are taught that God revealed to us, that in his one nature, there are three divine persons; and that there are not three divine persons: in that one holy, Catholic Church we are taught, that God has, by an unchangeable decree from all eternity predestined a large portion of the human family to eternal damnation, without any regard to their disposition, or their correspondence with grace; and we are also taught that he did not so predestinate them without such regard. We are taught that man is free, and has power to correspond with grace; and we are taught that he has no such freedom or ability. We are taught in that one Catholic Church, that Christ is the incarnate God, whom all men should adore; and, that he is not God, and that it is damnable idolatry to adore him. We are taught that he instituted bishops to govern his church, and that they are an order superior to priests. We are also taught that he not only did not so distinguish the orders, and make the institution, but that he condemned as impious and arrogant the principle on which such teaching rests. In that one Catholic Church we are taught, that by the divine institution the sacraments confer grace; and we are also taught that they do not confer grace. In this one Catholic Church we are taught ten thousand other contradictions; and this one Catholic Church is described by St. Paul, as the "pillar and ground of the truth;" of it the Saviour says: "And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican;" [and, again:] "He that believeth not, shall be condemned."

But which side of the contradiction is to be believed? Yea, even that will not save; for, if one proposition taught by this newly invented Catholic Church is believed, the contradictory proposition which she teaches is not believed. And thus the believer is an unbeliever, and every believer is to be condemned for his unbelief! What an ex-

hibition of Christian truth;—of Christian logic;—of human reason, and of divine wisdom. What a church is this, to triumph over the folly of infidelity. With this one, Catholic Church we, at least, have no concern. But, again, we are mistaken; for the essayists inform us that the "Romanists," as they are pleased to baptize us, are in this Catholic Church: [the title] "Catholic" belongs to them, but not exclusively to them. We cannot but feel grateful for the generosity of the writers. But "we will none of it." If we can have no better claim than this to the name, we are done with it. We will prefer, like the mother whom Solomon discovered, to let our competitors and would be partners, have the entire child, than [that] it should be thus mangled, in order to bestow upon us a useless and decaying shred.

The essayists then enter into a variety of pretty disquisitions to show that "Romanist" is not a name at which we should take offence; for the prelate whom we acknowledge as our chief is the Bishop of Rome. We admit all the fact, nor do we quarrel with what is to us a source of high congratulation and satisfaction, that we adhere to Rome, the see of Peter; that glorious church where Paul poured out all his doctrine with his blood, as St. John Chyrsostom [26] declares. We are proud of being Roman Catholics; and we say there is no claim to "Catholic," where there is separation from Rome. The discourtesy and the injustice do not consist in giving us the title of "Roman;" for we always claimed and always possessed it.

They say that "Papist" should not offend us, because the Papa, or Pope, is our first pastor. The fact is admitted to the same extent, and in the same manner, as that which we have just noticed respecting Rome. What then is the discourtesy! We answer—it is discourteous to attempt to deprive us of our old family name; it is discourteous to attempt to give it to our opponents; it is discourteous to attempt to substitute "nicknames" in its stead.

Let us look to facts, and not to etymologies. In [A. D.] 1500, there existed in Europe a Catholic Church universally admitted to be so:—whether it taught truth, or error, is not the question. It was then distinct from every other; and it stood alone, bearing this title. Martin Luther was a member of that Catholic Church. In 1515, Luther, Zuinglius, and King Henry VIII. of England, were members of that Catholic Church. John Calvin, was also at that period in the bosom of that Church. It then had been, time out of mind, in possession of the title

[26] The Bishop appears to have inadvertently ascribed to St. Chrysostom the well-known passage from Tertullian: "Ista quam felix Ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli, cum sanguine suo profuderunt." *De praescr.* c. xxxvi.

"Catholic." We care not why it was given: the possession, and the exclusive possession were notorious. In 1517, Luther left that Catholic Church, he had many adherents; they formed a separate body; they did not unite with any society previously in existence; they proclaimed the Catholic Church which they had left, to be unsound, erroneous, tyrannical, and so forth. Yet it was known to be the Catholic Church. Zuinglius also left it. "He proclaimed Luther to be an obstinate heretic, and a perverter of God's truth; Luther returned the compliment; both stood aloof from the Catholic Church, and King Henry VIII., wrote against the declamation of both, and supported the Catholic Church. In 1529, the princes who espoused the cause of Luther, protested at Spires, against the decree of the Diet; and they were known as Protestants, and frequently described themselves by that appellation. The opinions of Zinglius were sustained and modified by Calvin; and the body which adhered to them took the names of "Reformers," and called their society—The "Reformed Church." The Catholic Church was accused by them, as well as by the Protestants, of remaining incorrigibly and unchangeably attached to her old errors. She retained also the great bulk of her children in her communion;—she kept her doctrine, her government, and her name, but her opponents now commenced giving to her and her children a great variety of "nicknames;" and this, we say, was to give it a very mild appellation, exceedingly "discourteous." She remained unchanged in doctrine; and kept her name unchanged. The other folk came out from her; and, amongst other foul tricks; they called her ugly names, and would not give her the appellation which she had from the beginning.

King Henry quarrelled also with the Catholic Church, every one knows why;—but his son Edward, and his daughter Elizabeth went farther than he did. And by acts of the British Parliament, and by the public acts of the clergy of the newly modelled religion, their society was called the "Protestant Church of England," and they, too, lost their manners and called nicknames.

The religion of this Protestant Church of England was established in her colonies. When the "Old Thirteen" cast off the British yoke, many of their citizens retained their religion; which they next called that of the "Protestant Episcopal Church" of the United States of America. The name was their selection, not ours. Other citizens took or retained the names of Presbyterians, Baptists, Unitarians, Friends, Universalists, Methodists, Protestant Methodists, and so on. Now, their appellations are not nicknames given to them by us. We call them by their own admitted nomenclature, by the very names by which they have

sought and obtained their acts of incorporation; by which they are publicly recognised, by which they are respectfully addressed, and which they use in their own ecclesiastical proceedings.

In view of most of them, at several periods, the Catholic Church was no church at all:—she was the synagogue of Satan; she was Antichrist.

But now it seems there is to be one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, formed into such a patchwork as we have above essayed to describe, (and a curious sort of thing it is,) and we are invited to allow ourselves to be quilted into the medley. This really is quite condescending in our brethren, who, feeling some little qualms as to the validity of their title, prefer being admitted as tenants in common with us, to denying that we have any right, but asserting that the whole estate vests in themselves.

We, however, feel no inclination to admit the partnership. We merely keep our old family name,—and they may give us as many newfangled ones as they please. They only play an old trick, which St. Augustine says, was used by some folk, many of whose names are now scarcely recollected. Fourteen hundred years have elapsed, since that good and holy bishop tells us that they had a mighty great liking for the name of "Catholic;"—but, by some sort of good or evil chance, there was no fastening it on them; and, they had nicknames then, also, for the Catholic Church; but neither would they adhere to it. This has, indeed, been a process frequently gone through, during eighteen centuries, and always with just the same success.

> *Optat supremo collocare Sisyphus,*
> *In monte saxum: sed vetant leges Jovis.*
> "Poor Sisyphus would fix his stone,
> But Jove forbids it to be done."
>
> Hor. Epodes, 18, *Creech's Translation.*

If gentlemen think proper to exercise their ingenuity in etymological exercises, we can have no objection. Their object, however, in deny- to us an exclusive right to our old family name, is the same that their predecessors had, in the days of St. Augustine; and their efforts to prove that they mean no offence by giving us nicknames, are only the waste of time, and of ink, and of paper. These are declarations of about as much value to establish their politeness and liberality, as was the marching under a banner with the emblems of the majesty of law, by the Massachusetts delegation in Baltimore, to prove that the people of that state have no bigotry, that their courts administer justice to

Catholics, and that their legislature is influenced by justice, equity, humanity, charity, and self-respect.

We have seen at least half-a-dozen of these amusing essays; yet, they are so much alike, that they would seem to be only copies of one original.

THE RELIGION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

PART I. ESSAY READ AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF CHARLESTON, AT THE CITY HALL, JANUARY, 1827

Mr. President:—In tracing the history of nations, the philosopher discovers the basis upon which he must raise his general observations, because those observations are usually but results drawn from a multitude of facts. For this purpose, the history of the savage, is in some degree as necessary as the history of civilized man, because in the one we see the development of our principles and passions unrestrained by the rules of civilization, and in the other we find the consequences of those rules. Thus, the proper aim of philosophy being the discovery of that wisdom which will procure human happiness, the history of the human race is amongst the best studies of the philosopher.

But as man is an immortal being, whose existence continues beyond the span of his sojourn upon this earth, and who will remain in his new state during eternity, the philosopher ought to inquire in the history of the human race for those events which will tend proximately or remotely to elucidate the important concerns of his perpetual happiness; and several of those are to be found in the religion of nations. Leaving for a time the religion of revelation, let us examine some of the facts that history presents to our view in those times and places wherein no claim is made upon sufficient grounds, to supernatural instruction.

A writer who, by his pleasing style and bold manner, drew after him for a time, not only the light and thoughtless body of English readers, but even many of those who were distinguished for intellect, has by a fallacious theory diverted the attention of several men of genius and ability from fact to speculation; leaving the beaten paths of earth, he rose on the wing of imagination and caused his followers to soar above the plain way of events into the clouds of conjecture; and, substituting probability for evidence, he next assumed possibility for fact, and thus created amusing visions for established history; from what had thus been given in place of the proceedings of our predecessors he drew conclusions which were perfectly logical, and nothing was requisite to uphold their truth, save that which was the original deficiency, namely, the cor-

rectness of the statement upon which they rested. But a more discriminating age is detecting the aberrations of Mr. Hume, and we, too, may add our little examination to the general fund of evidence from which more useful materials may be procured by those who build their systems upon observation and not upon imagination.

One of this gentleman's theories was, that polytheism was the original religion of men, and that this original religion was created by an affrighted fancy. Yet even for this he deserves not the credit of originality, as a pagan poet had been amongst his leaders in the assertion; and with as little support from former fact, as might be easily seen. Mr. Hume proceeds from this assumption to state, that as man became enlightened, his reason corrected the superstition of his terror, and brought him to acknowledge the unity and supremacy of the deity; hence, he would conclude, that man has no knowledge of religion except from the progress of his reason, and that the notion of revealed religion is a delusion. If the facts were as the essayist assumed, his conclusions would be good. But if history will destroy the assumed correctness of his statements, his argument has no foundation. Hence, the investigation becomes to all men a matter of importance, and it would appear to be the duty of each nation to bear testimony to the facts which come under its own view.

If a man had been originally a savage, who reasoned himself into civilization, and that as he became civilized, he cast away his superstitions and religious errors, of which polytheism was the most absurd; the savage who chases the deer through our wilderness and who is by the opponents of revelation said to invoke the Great Spirit, who is one, and impervious to the senses, must surpass in his civilization the philosophers of Greece, the merchants of Egypt and of Tyre, and the senate and the people of Rome.—"Red-Jacket" is superior to Solon or to Cicero, "The Mad Tiger" is preferable to Socrates or to Virgil. Horace and Pliny must bow to the superior wisdom of "The Sleeping Wolf," and of "The Cat that Watches." Besides the absurdity of such consequences, which flow legitimately from the assumed principle and supposed fact, we have in safe history undoubted evidence that theism was man's first religion, from which he degenerated, and that the savage was not his original state. Sir William Jones in his essay on the gods of Greece, Italy, and India, very rationally elucidates the first of these positions, but I have seen it far better treated and upon a more extensive scale, by a French writer of the last century; the proof of the latter position cannot be mistaken or overlooked by any attentive reader of ancient history, and the writer to whom I have alluded finely shows the progress of tribes to barbarism

in the early ages of the world. When we cast our eyes upon Egypt, Persia, Greece, and the northwestern coast of Africa, we need scarcely recollect the shade which passed over Europe to confirm in our minds the truth that a civilized people may degenerate, and that the human mind is not steadily and uniformly progressive. There is a delusive semblance of philosophy which constructs theories by the force of imagination, and then regulates the nature of occurrences to harmonize with these preconcerted systems; there is also a duty which even to the philosopher is not always easy: that of reconciling minor facts to a principal occurrence of whose truth he has convincing evidence. In this case, candour, patience, and industry, will generally insure success in our attempt to remove the apparent incompatibilities, which at first sight startle the inexperienced, prevent he progress of the idle, and give occasion to the false conclusions of the thoughtless.

Of this description is the difficulty which presents itself when we view the varieties of the human race, in conjunction with the fact, that all those beings are the descendants of Noah. The difference of colour, the difference of structure, the difference of religion, the difference of customs, and the separation of continents, have been obstacles to the admission of the common origin at a period so comparatively recent. I shall not touch upon the first two topics, but I shall advert a little to the others, though the facts upon which my observations shall rest shall not be all adduced in the present essay.

I wish to make a passing remark upon the theory of Mr. Hume, before I enter more deeply upon my subject. We know that our red brethren are far from being civilized. We know that the inhabitants of Greece were much polished, that the Romans had excelled us in many of the accomplishments of the social state. Yet those Greeks and Romans were polytheists, and our Indian is said to be a theist. If the Indian, by the exercise of his reason, rose from polytheism, he must have risen from the barbarous state of the Greek and Roman, to his own state of superior civilization, or he has in his rude state preserved the original religion of his fathers, and thus their original religion was theism. No person will venture to make the first assertion. Mr. Hume would not permit us to make the second. But is the name of any man to impede our progress from the premises to a conclusion? In truth, they who declaim against the vassalage of the human mind to religion, will be found upon inquiry to be its worst tyrants. But, although the discovery might not be made upon our continent; to the antiquarian this exhibition is not new. Nations have been found when the Roman eagle soared in his loftiest flight and the Roman people bowed in their most degrading

idolatry, who would have been called barbarian, and these people, if not theists, had very limited polytheism. The Irish druid is said by many antiquarians to have been a theist. Evidence of his religion remains, but no evidence has been exhibited to show that his religion regarded more than one God; though that God was Beal. The Persian worshipped fire, yet it is not so clearly established that his adoration was always paid to the element and not to the Deity of whom earthly and celestial fire were only emblems.

If our opponent argues that the diversity of religion creates suspicion of a diversity of origin, he must allow the force of the principle that similarity of religious belief and worship seems to indicate a common origin. Indeed, though neither is fully evident, the latter is much the more probable. Few centuries have elapsed since European Christians were members of a common church, and had almost universal singleness of faith; into how many sects are they now divided, and how many families are so opposed in belief as that they who are united by the closest ties of nature are at perfect variance upon the score of religion? But if we discover a similarity between the religious observances of the American, and the Persian, and the Hindoo, we may more naturally conclude that they have sprung from a common stock, whence they brought those observances, or had a common teacher, or some intercourse by means of which one learned from the other; because it would contradict our experience to assert that this agreement is the result of accident.

The French writer to whom I have before alluded, traces the human family from its renewal after the deluge through its subsequent migrations, and finds in climate, in soil, in customs produced by special necessities and by occurrences of which we have in several instances good historical evidence, sufficient cause for the variance of worship and the origin of polytheism. The mythology of several portions of mankind is in admirable accordance with what he lays down. Thus the Egyptian found in the very leek of his garden a portion of that great spirit which animated the universe, but which poured fertility upon the land, when from the hidden recess of his dwelling he communicated himself through the medium of water. The Persian beheld his glories in the sun, and the heat of fire was the sacred mode through which his blessings were bestowed. In Scandinavia he spoke in the whirlwind, and passed along creating the solemnity of terror, and acknowledged by the howlings of the invisible spirits of the forest; his abode was on the summit of the rocks, or in the recesses of caverns, and in his rage urged on the desolating flood: far from exhibiting his beneficence by water, he gave it in his wrath. Thus the Scandinavian abhorred what the Egyptian worshipped.

I believe, then, that to the calm and unbiassed investigator of ancient history and of the customs and religious observances of those nations which have not been blessed with the light of revelation, it will appear that the original religion of mankind was theism, and that the several systems of polytheism and idolatry will appear to have arisen from various circumstances in different places, joined to the corruption of man's heart and the feebleness of his intellect; and that many kinds of superstition having thus arisen amongst a people whose ancestors had a common religion prescribing the worship of one God, the characters of those several superstitions were originally unlike, but having once been established in the primitive nations, the observances would continue with some alterations in those nations and in their colonies, and hence, that a striking similitude of religious observances between two tribes would lead towards the result that they had a common origin.

Of course the resemblance must be striking, and the coincidence, however exact, can form but one link of the chain which would bind them in a common origin. Upon this subject I shall close my observations with an extract from a dissertation from Sir William Jones, in whose sentiments, as here given, I fully concur:

"We cannot justly conclude, by arguments preceding the proof of facts, that one idolatrous people must have borrowed their deities, rites, and tenets from another; since gods of all shapes and dimensions may be framed by the boundless powers of imagination, or by the fraud and follies of men, in countries never connected: but when features of resemblance, too strong to have been accidental, are observable in different systems of polytheism, without fancy or prejudice to colour them and improve the likeness, we can scarcely help believing that some connexion has immemorially subsisted between the several nations who have adopted them. It is my design in this essay to point out such a resemblance between the popular worship of the old Greeks and Italians, and that of the Hindoos; nor can there be any room to doubt of a great similarity between their strange religions, and that of Egypt, China, Persia, Phœnice, Syria; to which perhaps we may safely add some of the southern kingdoms, and even islands of America; while the Gothic system, which prevailed in the northern regions of Europe, was not merely similar to that of Greece and Italy, but almost the same in another dress, with an embroidery of images apparently Asiatic. From all these if it can be satisfactorily proved, we may infer a union or affinity between the most distinguished inhabitants of the primitive world at the time when they deviated, as they did too early deviate, from the rational adoration of the only true God."

The learned and philosophical author compiled the essay in which this is found in the year 1784. In his discourse *On the Origin of Families and Nations*, delivered before the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, on the 23d of February, 1792, he states as a corollary from testimonies adduced in six previous annual discourses, the great likelihood "that the tribes of Mish, Cush and Rama, settled in Africa and India; while some of

them, having improved the art of sailing, passed from Egypt, Phœnice, and Phrygia, into Italy and Greece, which they found thinly peopled by former emigrants, of whom they supplanted some tribes, and united themselves with others; whilst a swarm from the same hive moved by a northerly course into Scandinavia, and another by the head of Oxus, and through the passes of the Imaus into Cashgher and Eighur, Khata and Khoten, as far as the territories of Chin and Tancut, where letters have been used, and arts immemorially cultivated; nor is it unreasonable to believe that some of them found their way from the eastern isles into Mexico and Peru, where traces were discovered of rude literature, and mythology, analogous to those of Egypt and India."

As my aim is to excite my associates and fellow-citizens to investigate the history of the aboriginal inhabitants of our rising and prosperous country, I may be again permitted to make an interesting extract from the work of the great President of the Asiatic Society, as it will exhibit in that elder continent the attainment of a result which I am convinced must always be found the consequence of impartial and judicious, and truly philosophical investigation. I would desire to urge forward on this continent those who have more leisure, more opportunity, and better qualifications than I can pretend to. I would entreat of them fully to investigate the history of a race too quickly, I fear, about to disappear from the land of their fathers, and to place on record those facts whose truth could be established, in the hope, and indeed with the confidence that in America the result would be the same as it has been found in Asia, as is testified and proved by Sir William Jones.

"In the first place we cannot surely deem it an inconsiderable advantage, that all our historical researches have confirmed the Mosaic accounts of the primitive world; and our testimony on that subject ought to have the greater weight, because if the result of our observations had been totally different, we should nevertheless have published them, not indeed with equal pleasure, but with equal confidence, for truth is mighty, and whatever be its consequence, must always prevail; but independently of our interest in corroborating the multiplied evidences of revealed religion, we could scarcely gratify our minds with a more useful and rational entertainment than the contemplation of those wonderful revolutions in kingdoms and states, which have happened within little more than four thousand years; revolutions almost as fully demonstrative of an all-ruling Providence, as the structure of the universe and the final causes, which are discernible in its whole extent and even in its minutest parts. Figure to your imagination a moving picture of that eventful period or rather a succession of crowded scenes rapidly changed. Three families migrate in different courses from one region, and in about four centuries establish very distant governments and various modes of society. Egyptians, Indians, Goths, Phenicians, Celts, Greeks, Latins, Chinese, Peruvians, Mexicans all sprung from the same immediate stem appear to start nearly at one time, and occupy at length those countries, to which they have given or from which they have derived their names: in twelve

or thirteen hundred years more, the Greeks overrun the land of their forefathers invade India, conquer Egypt, and aim at universal dominion; but the Romans appropriate to themselves the whole empire of Greece, and carry their arms into Britain, of which they speak with haughty contempt: the Goths, in the fulness of time, break to pieces the unwieldy colossus of Roman power, and seize on the whole of Britain, except its wild mountains; but even those wilds become subject to other invaders of the same Gothic lineage; during all these transactions, the Arabs possess both coasts of the Red Sea, subdue the old seat of their first progenitors, and extend their conquests on one side, through Africa into Europe itself; on another beyond the borders of India, part of which they annex to their flourishing empire; in the same interval, the Tartars, widely diffused over the rest of the globe, swarm into the northeast, whence they rush to complete the reduction of Constantine's beautiful domains, to subjugate China, to raise in these Indian realms a dynasty splendid and powerful, and to ravage, like the two other families, the devoted regions of Iran: by this time the Mexicans and the Peruvians, with many races of adventurers variously intermixed, have peopled the continent and isles of America, which the Spaniards, having restored their old government in Europe discover, and in part overcome: but a colony from Britain, of which Cicero ignorantly declared that it contained nothing valuable, obtain the possession, and finally the sovereign dominion of extensive American districts, whilst other British subjects acquire a subordinate empire in the finest provinces of India, which the victorious troops of Alexander were unwilling to attack. This outline of human transactions, as far as it includes the limits of Asia, we can only hope to fill up, to strengthen and to colour, by the help of the Asiatic literature; for in history as in law, we must not follow streams, when we may investigate fountains, nor admit any secondary proof, where primary evidence is attainable."

The discourse from which this is extracted was delivered on the 28th of February, 1793. Little more than thirty years have elapsed since that period, and how many astonishing revolutions have occurred?—Take the map of Europe as it then was, and compare it with what is now placed before the world? Events which might be spread over the pages which history allots to centuries are crowded within a portion of the tablet which is given to individual recollection. Crowns are immersed in the blood of those whom they were given to decorate. Wild anarchy celebrates her orgies amid the mangled corpses of a devoted nation, and dares to pollute the sacred name of freedom, with her blaspheming lips. The very divisions of time are changed to attempt the obliteration of that first institution of the Creator, which gives rest to the weary and hope to the desponding; the vilest outcasts of the more virtuous sex are placed upon the altars of the living God for homage of those men who boasted that they were to illuminate a benighted world. Congregated potentates of Europe are resisted successfully by a stripling to whom this nation entrusts her destines; almost each of her capitals sees him seated above her throne, and almost every one of her monarchs is the creature of his will, until the blasphemy has ceased, and the im-

piety is removed; then he who was in himself a dynasty becomes a captive and perishes in prison as singular in its construction as was the career of him whose ashes it contains.

How rapid also has been the progress of this western hemisphere within that little time? Here too the work of centuries has been accomplished in less than half a century. Britain, it is true, possesses one million of subjects on our northern frontier; can these be the American districts of which the president of the Asiatic Society boasted that Britain had the sovereignty? At the time of the delivery of his discourse, perhaps some lurking hope remained that the old colonies would request the protection of their former stepmother! But that hope has long since been extinguished, and for ever; where those millions of subjects had been in a state of political dependence, and several of them under religious disqualification, now over ten millions of freemen enjoy all the advantages of civil and religious liberty: their flag is seen on every ocean, and their consuls reside in every port. The Spaniard too has lost his dominion, and on the south as in the west, the progress of freedom and of improvement is indeed astonishing. And may I be permitted to add the expression of my hope that "the beautiful domains of Constantine" may receive from heaven and from earth, sufficient aid to be at length successful in their effort to expel the drones of the northeastern hive!

But what has been my object in this apparent digression? To show that when we calculate upon the progress of events by the progress of time, we are frequently led to erroneous conclusions. Frequently indeed appearing to accelerate his pace, he seems to outstrip events, and a century would, by some whose system of analogy is too perfect for an imperfect state of being, be charged as erroneously inserted. At other times the philosophist, though the evidence of facts was perfect, would by speculation prove to his own satisfaction, and to the amusement of others, that it was impossible for these occurrences to have taken place within the period assigned in the record. He would thus treat history with as little mercy as Procrustes treated his guests.

I would propose that such speculations should be altogether laid aside, that we should endeavour to follow that plan upon which the Asiatic Society proceeded, that we should in America endeavour to discover and to discuss, and to preserve those facts connected with the aborigines of our country, which might tend not only to exhibit much curious and interesting information to gratify the public, but which would greatly tend to elucidate subjects which are of great importance to the whole human race. For my part I can produce but little, but I shall communicate even that, small as it is, rather in the hope of excit-

ing others whose opportunities and leisure are greater than mine are likely to be.

My present object is to lay before you some general observations which I think arise from the view of facts respecting the religion of the aboriginal possessors of this vast continent. Those which I shall exhibit are very few and very deficient of interest in themselves, but they may prove in their result very useful to lead us to rational conclusions as to the origin of this people. I am aware that my information is extremely limited upon this subject, but probably some of the facts upon which my observations rest are not very generally known, and my effort will at all events, I trust, produce one good effect of eliciting for the public benefit much more extensive and interesting details than I have had the leisure or the opportunity to collect. The facts to which I refer are testified by the missionaries of the Roman Catholic church, and are such as have fallen under their own observation during their residence in the midst of the tribes whose language they learned, and whose customs they carefully observed, that they might be able to discharge the solemn duty in which they were engaged. The relators are persons who had received the most liberal education, and who voluntarily relinquished all the advantages of civilized society, and buried themselves in the depths of the wilderness, exposed to every privation and affliction, for the sake of bearing the testimony of truth to a neglected portion of their brethren; they foresaw the probability of martyrdom, and it was not unfrequently the recompense of their laborious devotion to the Gospel of truth. Their letters were not intended generally for publication, but were the official communications of what was their observation of the progress which they made, transmitted to their superiors. Thus we may safely look upon them as good witnesses, being competent and faithful. [27]

In a former part of this essay, I used the assertion of those who, whilst they denied the truth of revelation, asserted that our Indian tribes were pure Theists, who worshipped only one God. In order to refute their assumed principle, and to destroy that theory which they have substituted for history, I now come to the examination of the questions. Is the religion of the Indian tribes of America pure Theism, or are they Idolaters? Have they any religious system? And if they have, what is its leading characteristic?

Father Sebastian Rasles, a Jesuit, who was slain at Narantsonak,

[27] These interesting letters as well as a large number of most important documents, from which Bishop England drew his informations for this essay, are now recorded in the monumental work entitled *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, 73 vols., published in Cleveland, 1896-1901.—S. G. M.

an Indian settlement, in what is now the state of Maine, on the 23d of August, 1724, left France in July, 1689, for the missions of Canada, and arrived on the 13th of October, in the same year, at Quebec, when he immediately commenced the study of the Indian languages. Father de la Chasse, of the same society, and superior of the missions of New France, writes of him in the month of October, subsequent to his death, "we were surprised at the facility with which he could acquire languages, and the application with which he sought the knowledge of the dialects of the different tribes. There is not a dialect on this continent, of which he had not some tincture. Besides the language of the Abnakis, which he spoke during a long period, he knew also the Huron tongue, that of the Ottoways and of the Illinois; he had served with great fruit in the several missions where they are used."

In the month of October, preceding his death, Father Rasles wrote to his brother a very long letter, giving an outline of his labours and observations, during upwards of thirty years' continual residence in one or other of the tribes which occupied the range of country from Kaskaskia to Lake Superior, and skirting the then British settlements round on the north to the mouth of the Kennebec. In this he remarks, that he found the general principle of their superstition was the same as that which he discovered amongst the Ottowas. This people, he states, worship Manitous, and the description which he gives of this worship bears a strong similitude to that which we find amongst pagan nations, save that their worship was not generally public and social, but private, and paid by them individually. Though they speak of spirit, yet being acquainted only with sensible objects, especially the animals found in their country, they imagine that in these animals or rather in their skins or plumage there exists Manitous, or Genii, or spirits who govern the universe, and are the masters of life and death. They call the great spirit of all beasts and birds Oussakita, or, as we, perhaps, would pronounce it, Wassakita. There are Manitous who preside over nations, and each individual has his own. When they went to hunt, they made offerings of tobacco, powder, and lead, and of the skins of beasts, well dressed, to Wassakita. The offering was fastened to the end of a pole and raised on high, accompanied by a prayer to the following effect:—"Wassakita, we present to thee the herb for smoke, and the means of slaying beasts, vouchsafe to receive these presents, and do not permit the game to escape our track; allow us to kill them in great numbers, and of the very fattest, that our children may not want either clothing or food."

Michibichi was the Manitou of the waters of fish, and sacrifice was

offered to him in nearly the same manner, when they were going to fish, or to make a voyage; this sacrifice was made by casting into the waters, tobacco, food, kettles, and so forth, beseeching him that the waters of the river might flow gently, that no rock should break the canoe, and that he would grant them abundance of fish.

I am greatly inclined to believe that the mode in which individuals selected their Manitous is the foundation of those names of Indians, which are so peculiar to our aborigines. The subject might, perhaps, be worth an inquiry, unless more be known concerning it than I am as yet aware of. The account given by Father Rasles of the selection, is as follows:

"When an Indian wishes to adopt a Manitou, the first animal which presents itself to his imagination during sleep is generally that which he selects; he kills one of this description, and places the skin or plumage in the most respectable part of his hut; then he prepares a feast in its honour, during which he makes his harangue, in terms the most respectful; thenceforward it is recognized as his Manitou.

He also gives an account of the manner in which the Indian uses this consecrated spoil: "Besides the common Manitou, each has his own individually, which is either a bear, or a beaver, or a bustard, or some such animal. He carries the skin of this animal with him to war, on hunting expeditions, and on his journeys; he is persuaded that it will preserve him from every danger, and make him successful in his enterprises."

Amongst the different tribes through which he passed, from leaving the Hurons and the Ottowas, and arriving in the country of Illinois, he reckons, of different tongues, the following tribes, Maskoutings, Jakis, Omikoues, Iripegouans, Outagamis. Most of those names probably differ in the mode of spelling, from that by which we should better recognise them. However, in 1768, Carver informs us that the Ottegamias were met by him, but farther west; and in 1780, Hutchins mentions them as a considerable tribe in Illinois. Between those five nations and the Ottowas, he states the only difference is in language, consequently, they were worshippers of the Manitous.

The next piece of evidence which I adduce, is founded upon the testimony of Father Gabriel Marest, of the same society, in a letter written by him to Father German, also a Jesuit. It is dated from Kaskaskia, November 9, 1732; Father Rasles was still living, but had been fourteen or fifteen years withdrawn from the mission of Illinois, and stationed amongst the Abnakis. In stating the situation of the place from which he writes, he informs the person to whom his letter is addressed, that the Illinois discharges itself into the Mississippi in little less than the

39th degree of latitude. I believe it is but about eight minutes south of the 39th degree, upon our best modern maps; seven leagues below this, he fixes the mouth of the Missouri, which he writes was better known then by the name of Pekitanoui, or the muddy river. After describing the country, as far as the Wabash, and fixing the latitude of Kaskaskia in the 38th degree, where it appears upon our modern maps, he proceeds to give the account of people who occupied the country:

It would be hard, he writes, to say what was their religion; for it consisted only in some superstitious practices by which their credulity was imposed upon, and giving similar reasons as those which we have before seen for the worship of the Manitous in the manner described, he proceeds to a more particular detail.

"The warriors," he writes, "carry their Manitous in a mat, and unceasingly invoke them to be victorious over their enemies; the charlatans likewise have recourse to their Manitous when they compose their medicine, or heal their sick; they accompany those invocations with songs and dances, and frightful contortions, to create the belief that they are agitated by their Manitous." "Who, they say, can resist the power of the Manitou? Is he not the master of life and of death? If the patient dies, the death is attributed to some occurrence which took place after the departure of the charlatan." I have seen, in one of the letters, an account of the attack made upon an Iroquois Christian, as the death of a woman who had been under the influence of the Manitous, was attributed by the charlatan to the repetition of the beads. Father Marest relates a similar occurrence within a month previous to the date of this letter in Illinois, and also gives an account of many narrow escapes of his own on similar occasions; this father places upon record, the account of a very curious public conference, which took place some time previous to the date of his letter, between Father Marmet and one of the conjurers of the tribe of Mascoutens, who dwelt upon the Wabash. The conjurer adored a buffalo as his Manitou. The father gradually brought him to declare that it was not the buffalo, but the Manitou of the buffalo, which was under the earth, was the object of his adoration, and that it was this Manitou which did benefit to his patients; he farther brought him to acknowledge that the bear, the wolf, and the other animals whose Manitous his countrymen adored, were also powerless. He then asked if man, who was the master of beasts, had not a special Manitou, to which the other answered, that doubtless he had, whence the father drew the inference for him, that as man had dominion over the beasts, the Manitou of man was superior to all others, and that it was folly to invoke those who were subordinate, to the utter neglect of him who was super-

ior. Whatever the force of the reasoning might have been, it was lost upon the conjurer and his followers.

The fact of sacrifice being offered to the Manitou is very clearly established in this letter of Father Marest. He states that a great mortality occurred amongst the Indians on the Wabash, near the station of Father Marmet. During the prevalence of the sickness, the conjurers, finding the deaths increase, held a solemn assembly, at which nearly forty dogs were slain, and the victims thus immolated, were lifted on poles and offered to the Manitous, in order to implore the removal of the plague. When the mortality increased they attributed it to their Manitou having been overcome by the deity of the French, and the chief conjurer made a procession round the fort, acknowledging that life and death were in the hands of the Manitou of the French, and that the Indians were almost exterminated, and intreating the good Mantitou to keep death back and to send forth life from his coffer, that they might be healed. An instance of an opposite description is also testified in this letter. Father Bergier, the missionary in the village of the Tamarouas, having died, the conjurers came into the village after the departure of Father Marest, who had interred him, and danced with great joy round the cross which had been planted in the centre of the village, and each boasting as he sung that it was his Manitou that caused the missionary's death; they concluded by pulling up the cross and breaking it to pieces.

Coming down farther on the Mississippi, we shall make, for the present, but a transitory visit to the Natchez. In the month of July, 1730, Father Petit, of New Orleans, gave an account of the massacre committed upon the French at Natchez, on the 28th of the preceding November, to Father Avaugour, the procurator of the North American missions.

In this letter he states that the Natchez is the only station on this continent that appears to have a system of religion regularly established, and he finds much similarity between some of their practices and religious customs, and those of the ancient Romans; probably we shall draw different conclusions at another time, than that the aborigines of this continent either were a Roman colony, or derived their religion from Italy. I shall at present confine myself to a mere recital of facts, of whose truth I am convinced by the testimony. At Natchez they had a temple filled with idols; these idols were figures of men and beasts, and were held in the highest veneration. The architecture was indeed rude; the place had the appearance of a large oven of earth, about one hundred feet in circumference, and the entrance to its interior was through a door of only four feet in height, by three wide; it had no win-

dow, and the roof was protected by a triple covering of mats. On the outside were the wooden figures of three eagles, one white, one red, and one yellow: in front of the door was a porch, with an outer door, the guardian of the temple held his station in this porch, a palisade enclosed the whole, on this were placed the skulls of those whom their warriors had slain.

Within the temple were shelves upon which the bones of their chieftains were kept in baskets, and those of their attendants who were immolated to accompany them in death, were placed near the remains of the chief. But one shelf, which stood alone, had several painted boxes, in which the idols were kept; they were stone and brick figures of men and women, the heads and tails of extraordinary serpents, the skins of owls stuffed with grass, pieces of crystal, and the jaws of large fishes. In the year 1699, they had a bottle and the bottom of a glass which they preserved with great care. The sisters of the great chief were the only women who had permission to enter the temple, and only some of the men had the privilege; the common people were not allowed even to carry in the food which was to be placed near the relics of their friends, to satisfy their spirits, but it was carried by the guardian. About a century since the nation had six villages only, but each possessed its temple; however, their statement was that at one period they had sixty towns, in each of which there was an edifice of this kind.

I suspected, at first, that the idols might have been only kept as in a museum, more as objects of curiosity than for the purposes of worship; but a little examination soon convinced me that this conjecture was unfounded, as I perceived distinct evidence to the contrary. Two great festivals were annually celebrated at the temple, at the termination of each of which, in the exhortation to the discharge of duty given by the chief, the principal and concluding admonition regarded the worship of the spirits which resided in the temple, and the instruction of the children in their religious duties to them. In the year 1702, the temple of Natchez was destroyed by lightning, and seven or eight women, who cast their children into the flames for the purpose of appeasing the gods by the sacrifice of what they held most dear, were publicly applauded for this act of religion by the chief, who also exhorted the other women, on similar occasions, to imitate so excellent an example. The first fruits of the harvest were also brought to be offered at this temple, and all gifts made to the nation were first presented within, by the guardian, to the deities, before they were taken to the chief who subsequently distributed them. A perpetual fire was kept burning herein, but great care was taken to prevent its blazing; the guardian, who during his quarter of

duty staid in the porch, had care of this fire, the old men brought the fuel, which was either oak or walnut tree, and the logs are never laid over each other lest a blaze should be produced.

The chief appoints the guardians of the temple. But the sun was their principal object of adoration, and the chief was therefore styled the brother of the sun, and his hut was always built upon an elevated mound of earth, and of a similar appearance with the temple itself; at sunrise he came out to salute his elder brother with three cries, for which purpose his door was open to the east; after this salutation he called for his calumet, and offered the three first whiffs of smoke from his tobacco, then he pointed out the course which his brother was to travel to the west, and thus concluded his morning service.

Father Petit also informs us that when the Natchez went to war, the head warriors carried their idols, which they called their spirits, securely wrapped up in skins, and in the evening, when they were about to encamp, they hung those idols upon a red pole, fixed in a slanting way, so that the idols should hang at the side where their enemies lay. Before laying down, the warriors danced singly before them, each with his tomahawk bravely menacing the distant foe. The doctors, also, when they attended their patients carried their spirits, as they call them, in baskets; and made frequent invocations to them for aid during their stay or their operations. Other conjurers regulated the weather, and some undertook to procure drought, whilst the power of others extended only to rain, it being acknowledged that the same spirit or idol could not procure both. Father Petit, who has given this account during his priority at New Orleans, had previously spent a considerable time amongst the Choctaws.

One consideration forces itself upon the mind. If the Indians of this continent had been theists, they would have been almost an exception to those other hordes of whom we have any history, and must have appeared so to those missionaries who would not have failed to notice the difference and to mention the fact: but they, on the contrary, call them idolaters, and place them on a level with the uncivilized tribes of whom the church had in all ages numerous accounts, and who were almost universally polytheists. The history of their manitous and the gradations, and of the opposition of those manitous, and of the opposition supposed to exist between the Indian and the French manitous is plainly exhibited. The worship of the sun and of the idols in the temple of Natchez and in the other temples of that nation, all tend clearly to the conclusion that the aboriginal Indians of what is now the middle range of our states, were polytheists, and as we have reason to believe that their

religion was a correct general exhibition of that of their brethren, I think it may be fairly deduced that the religion of North America was polytheism. Such also was that of most nations when, following their own devices, they swerved from the ancient religion of their progenitors, which was the worship of one god, as we have good proof, from history and from other monuments, to establish.

Should my more urgent duties permit my devoting some time to the investigation which I have commenced, I shall follow up my inquiries regarding the origin of our aboriginal tribes. But it will afford me more abundant gratification should some more competent person undertake the task.

PART II. ARTICLE FROM THE "SOUTHERN REVIEW"

It must be an object of interest, at least to every American, to become acquainted with the customs and manners of the people who once possessed the soil which he now inhabits. The first European settlers do not, however, appear to have had sufficient leisure, opportunity, or inclination for the research, to enable them to obtain that knowledge, or to leave upon record what they did learn. Engaged in the search after precious metals, the providing for pressing wants, guarding against menacing danger, or repairing the consequences of disaster, they knew little of the language of tribes which they despised for their barbarism, and dreaded for their cruelty, cunning, and deceit: they appear to have had little of that philosophical curiosity which leads to investigation for mere speculative purposes, and they felt more interested in learning how to improve their fortune, than in discovering whom the savages worshipped, and by what ceremonial. The history of the colonies, as well as that of the states, exhibits to us the continued retreat of the red man from the encroachments of the white, and the latter still occupied with his own projects, regardless of the domestic or peculiar concerns of the former. This will probably satisfy the inquirer, who would ask why we possess so few documents and so little information upon the subject of Indian customs.

However, the work which we now examine is well calculated, to a certain extent, to supply much of what appears wanting upon this head.

This collection of letters (*Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses.* Tomes vi. vii. viii. et ix. A Paris. Chez J. G Merigot, le jeune. MDCCLXXXI.) is a selection from several which had been received in Europe, during a considerable portion of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, from

missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church, stationed in various regions of both hemispheres. The edition now before us consists of twenty-five volumes, four of which, viz.: the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth, contain the documents regarding the American continent and the West Indies. The editor commences his preface to this portion, with a passage which we translate:

"The Memoirs of America present to the reader's curiosity objects very different from those of the missions of the Levant. The islands of the Archipelago, Constantinople, Syria, the adjacent provinces, the kingdom of Persia, and that of Egypt preserve, as yet, traces of their ancient splendour; and in these countries, which we may call degraded, still everything reminds us of the industry, the riches, and the magnificence of their former inhabitants. America, on the contrary, scarcely presents to us anything besides lakes, forests, unreclaimed lands, rivers, and savages.

"Cupidity, and a sort of restlessness, produced the discovery of this fourth portion of the world. We treat here neither of the voyages nor of the conquests of the first navigators. A sufficient number of other writers have described the hardihood of the enterprises, and the too direful success of the modern argonauts; immense regions discovered, depopulated, devastated; millions of men, free and tranquil in their possessions, immolated as victims to the avarice, even to the caprices of their new guests, might indeed excite our interest, but would create in us a more afflicting sympathy."

The writer then vindicates France from such charges, and proceeds to show how she entered upon her lands by purchase, and cultivated peace with the Indians; that the King of France, informed of the superstition, ignorance, and barbarism of his new allies, sent missionaries of the Society of Jesuits to the Iroquois, the Hurons, the Illinois, and so forth. He proceeds:

"Those icy regions have been watered by their sweat and soaked with their blood. Several died in torments, the bare recollection of which causes our nature to shudder, and all suffered incredible pain and fatigue.

"Obliged, in some degree, to become savages with those barbarians, thus to bring them to be men, that they might subsequently become Christians, they learned their languages, lived according to their manners, traversed the woods in their society, and became like to them in everything which was not evil, that they might induce them to hear, to love, to esteem, and to practice that which was good."

The opportunities for observation which these men possessed, were therefore of the very best description; of the ability to turn these opportunities to account, few will be disposed to raise a question; and for the fidelity of their relation, perhaps as little doubt can exist, as in most cases of good testimony; they may be considered as perfectly disinterested, and the relations were given by persons, who, because of their remote stations, could not have conspired to frame a system of deceit; they were given to affectionate friends and for superiors, to whom they were bound by the most solemn and sacred ties, to be plain and candid. If ever

documents possessed internal evidence of truth, that evidence is found in these letters, of which the editor says:

"They bear, as do all the other letters of this work, a character of simplicity and of truth, which affects and which persuades. There is observable throughout, great care to hazard nothing, to speak only what is within the writer's knowledge, only of what he has examined with a scrupulous attention, a taste for observation which extends to everything, a desire to be informed and to communicate knowledge, the result probably of a good education, of a laudable emulation, and of a sensitiveness happy and profound, which, without permitting the missionary to forget what is required by the most pure and ardent zeal, teaches him to discover the secret of uniting with the love of useful science the most continued, persevering, and painful duties of his ministry."

Having premised these few observations as to the credit of the writers, the first question which presents itself to us is, whether the Aborigines were pure theists, as has been frequently asserted, or whether their religion, like that of the other degraded and barbarous nations known to us, was a blending of polytheism, idolatry, and superstition. Upon this subject, we meet with the following passage, in a letter of Father Gabriel Marest, a Jesuit missionary in Canada, to his superior Father Lamberville, procurator of the Canada missions. Father Marest was chaplain to two vessels which sailed on the 10th of August, 1696, from Quebec, under the command of M. D'Iberville, to take possession of stations which the British were forming upon the shore of Hudson's Bay. On the 13th of October, the English surrounded a small fort at the confluence of two rivers, which he calls the Bourbon and the St. Therese, the former of which, the English, he says, called the Pornetton, in the latitude of something more than 57 degrees. Upon the arrival of the expedition in September, Father Marest states that he applied with assiduity to perfect himself in the language of the Indians. In September of the following year, the English recaptured the fort, and the writer was taken and sent to Plymouth, in England, where he was confined in prison until exchanged. He states, that, during the year of his residence at the fort and in its vicinity, upwards of three hundred canoes had arrived, for the purposes of traffic, from seven or eight of the neighbouring tribes, the most distant, the most numerous, and the most considerable of which were the Creeks and the Assiniboels, the former of which were sometimes called the Knistinnons: the language of the Creeks he calls the Algonquin, and that of the Assiniboels the same as that of the Scioux. He then describes their places of residence and alliances; after which, he proceeds to describe their religion, regarding which we give the following passage:

"As to the religion which they profess, I believe that it is the same as that of the other savages: I do not know, as yet, with precision in what their idolatry

consists. I do know that they have a sort of sacrifices; they are great jugglers; they use, as the others do, the pipe which they call *calumet*; they smoke at the sun; they also smoke towards absent persons; they have frequently smoked to our fort and our vessel: yet I cannot tell you, for certain, what nations of the divinity they might have, not having been able to fathom them. I will only add, that they are extremely superstitious, greatly debauched, that they live in simultaneous polygamy, and in a great estrangement from the Christian religion.''

Although this extract gives us very little information respecting the facts which we seek, yet it exhibits to us the candour of the writer, and the difficulty of attaining, in a short time, accurate notions of a religion to which we are perfect strangers: whilst it is a striking contrast to the presumpion of persons, who, with less opportunity, have in similar cases dogmatically pronounced upon what they did not understand.

The fifth letter, in the sixth volume, is one from Father Sebastian Rasles, a Jesuit, to his brother, who lived in France, and is dated at Narantsouac, on the 12th of October, 1723. It was written, at the request of his brother, to give him some notion of the state of the country and its inhabitants. He recites the history of his departure from France, and his travels and residence in America, in such a manner as to exhibit to us his full competency as a witness:

''On the 23d of July, in the year 1689, I embarked at Rochelle, and after a good voyage of three months, arrived at Quebec on the 13th of October; I immediately began to learn the language of the Indians, which is very difficult: for it is not enough to study the terms and their signification, as well as to lay in a stock of words and phrases; it is, besides, necessary to know the turn and arrangement which they receive from the natives, which can be attained only by intercourse and habits of intimacy with them.

''I thence went to live in a village in the nation of the Abnakis, which was in a forest, about three leagues from Quebec: this village was inhabited by about two hundred Indians, most of whom were Christians,'' and so forth.

He next describes their mode of building, dress and occupations; after which, he continues:—

''It was in the midst of this people, who are considered the least rude of our Indians, that I served my missionary apprenticeship. My principal occupation was to study their language. It is learned with great difficulty, especially when one has no other teachers but Indians.''

After a dissertation upon the languages, and giving specimens of the dialects of the Abnakis, the Algonquins, the Hurons, and the Illinois, he states, that after nearly two years residence in this nation, he was ordered to the missions in the country of the Illinois. Previous, however, to his setting off, he was detained three months in Quebec, studying the Algonquin tongue, and on the 13th of August, probably 1692, he set out from Quebec in a canoe, to go through rivers and lakes, over unreclaimed lands, and in the midst of forests, a journey of eight hun-

dred leagues to the nation of the Illinois. After much suffering near the lake of the Hurons, the company having been scattered by bad weather, he had to send some provisions to his comrades from Missilimakinak, where two missionaries were stationed, one for the Hurons, the other for the Outaouacks—probably Ottowas. Of those he gives the following account:—

"They are very superstitious and much attached to the juggling of their charlatans. They claim an origin equally absurd and ridiculous! They pretend to have come from three families, and each family composed of five hundred persons. Some are of the family of Michabou, or "the Great Hare." They pretend that this Great Hare was a man of prodigious size, that he spread nets in the water to the depth of eighteen arms length, and that his hand was scarcely sunk to the armpit; that one day during the deluge, he sent the castor to discover land; but this animal not having returned, he sent another, which brought back a small quantity of earth covered with froth; that he went to that part of the lake whence the earth was brought, and which formed a small island; that he walked in the water around it, and that this island became extraordinarily large, on which account they attributed to him the creation of the earth: they add, that after having effected this, he fled to the sun, which is the usual place of his residence; but before leaving this earth, he directed that upon the death of any one of his descendants, their bodies should be burned, and the ashes cast into the air, that they might more easily ascend to the heavens; that if this was neglected, snow would descend to rest upon their lands, their rivers and lakes would remain locked up with ice, and not being able to procure fish, which is their usual diet, they would die in the spring."

Believing, as we do, the Mosaic account of the general deluge, and the origin of all the families of the earth from Noah, and seeing amongst so many Asiatic tribes the similar accounts of an extraordinary man, who, according to some statements, was saved in a canoe; according to others, walked over the waters; or which, like this, make his size gigantic, and thus enable him to overtop the billows; we look upon them all to be the rude traditions of degenerate nations, who, in their wilds and barbarism, preserve the outline of that history which Shem, Ham, and Japheth related to their children, and the accurate detail of which is recorded in the sacred volume. We also view the departure of the great Hare for the sun, together with the worship which it is evident several of our tribes paid to that luminary, to afford a strong presumption of an intimate alliance between the progenitors of our red brethren and some of the Asiatic nations; this, we think, is also much strengthened by their precept for burning the bodies, of the deceased, and esteem for jugglers, as well as their expertness in the practice. How far the tradition of the three original families might be founded upon the fact of the three sons of Noah, we shall not venture to determine; but, we strongly incline to the opinion, that most of the early practices of pagans,

and their principal religious traditions are founded upon incorrect and mistaken views of the primitive theism, and the history of the early patriarchs.

Father Rasles gives us an account of the manner in which some circumstances served to confirm the family of Michabou in their notions.

"It is but a few years since, that the winter having been longer than usual, there was a general consternation amongst the Indians of the family of the Great Hare. They had recourse to their usual jugglings; they frequently met to devise the means of dissipating the inimical snow which obstinately kept possession of the earth, when an old woman addressed them thus:—'My children, you have no sense; you know the orders left by the Great Hare to burn the bodies of the dead, and to cast their ashes to the winds, that they might the more speedily return to their country in heaven, and you have disobeyed those orders by leaving, during several days, the body of a man in this vicinity without being burned, as though he did not belong to the family of the Great Hare. Repair your fault without delay; be careful to burn it if you desire to banish the snow.' 'You are right, mother,' said they; 'you have more sense than we have, and the advice which you give restores us to life.' They immediately detached twenty-five men to burn the body; they were occupied on the journey and return during about fifteen days; meantime the thaw came, and the snow disappeared. They heaped praises and presents upon the old woman who had given this advice; and this event, quite within the range of natural causes, as it was, greatly served to keep them in their foolish and superstitious credulity."

The second family of the Ottawas are the descendants of Namepich, or the Carp, the eggs of which being laid on the bank of a river, were impregnated by the sun, and from them sprung a woman who is their mother.

The third are derived from Machovo, or the Bear, but no explanation is given of the mode of their descent.

The custom of burning the dead is peculiar to the family of the great Hare; the others inter the deceased, and a detailed account is given of the modes in which the chiefs are decorated for interment, and of the funeral chaunt. Our readers are sufficiently acquainted with those particulars. But the following extract will, probably, exhibit what is not so generally known:

"Where the superstition of this people appears most extravagant, is in the worship which they pay to what they call their Manitou. As they know only the beasts with which they live in their forests, they imagine in those brutes, or rather in their skins, and the plumage of birds, a sort of genius which governs all things, and is the master of life and death. According to them, there are Manitous common to the whole nation, and special ones for each individual. Oussakita or Wassakita is, they say, the great Manitou of all the animals that walk upon the earth or that fly in the air. It is he who governs them; thus when they go to hunt, they offer to him tobacco, powder, lead, and skins well prepared, which they tie to a long pole, and lifting them in the air, they say, 'Oussakita, we give thee to smoke, and we offer

thee the means of killing animals; vouchsafe to be pleased with these gifts, and do not permit the beasts to escape our path; permit us to kill them in goodly numbers, and of the fattest condition, that our children may have no want of clothing or of food.' ''

The Manitou of the waters and of fish, is called Michibichi, probably the same as Mississippi: they offer sacrifice to him when they go out to fish, or make voyages: for this purpose, they throw tobacco, food and kettles into the river, and they beseech the genius to cause the waters to flow slowly, and to save their canoes from rocks, and to grant them abundance of fish.

Each individual has also his peculiar Manitou, which is a bear, a castor, a bustard, or such like. In the selection of his Manitou, an Indian regarded his choice (whatever it were) as directed by some superior influence which exhibited to him in his sleep that animal, which it would become him to adopt. He as soon as possible after this imagination, killed one of the description, and kept his skin or plumage in the place of greatest honour in his hut, feasted his friends, respectfully harangued the spoils; and adopted his Manitou. Thenceforth its preservation became a peculiar object of his religious care, and itself an object of his veneration; he was specially careful to take it with him to war and to hunt, that it might be a source of his protection and safety.

Their attachment to the indulgences permitted by their education, was, in general, a serious obstacle to their embracing Christianity. The missionaries found in their tribes, as amongst civilized men, that human nature was everywhere the same; that men frequently evaded the search after truth, or disregarded it when discovered, whensoever its profession was likely to require the sacrifice of passion or of convenience upon the altar of duty. Writing of the Illinois, the following is an extract from the letter of Father Rasles.

''That which we understand by the word Christianity, is known to the savages only by the name prayer. Thus, when in the course of this letter, I might inform you that any savage nation has embraced prayer, the meaning will be that it either has become Christian, or is disposed to become so. There would be far less trouble in the conversion of the Illinois, if prayer would permit them to retain polygamy: they acknowledge that prayer is good, and they are delighted that their wives and children should be taught, but when they are spoken to for their own concerns upon the subject, one immediately finds how hard it is to fix their natural unsteadiness, and bring them to resolve upon each having but one wife, and to have her for ever.''

It is not our business nor our disposition to preach, but we may be permitted to remark, that if Father Rasles now lived, he might find that what he witnessed among the aboriginal Illinois, was not peculiar to the savage nor to the pagan.

As our object in this review is rather to collect facts than to write

a dissertation, and by this collection to add to our store from the gatherings of foreigners, as well as to excite our fellow-citizens to a more laborious and systematic research into the antiquities of our country, we shall prefer putting together a number of passages from the letters, to entering into speculations as to what might have occurred. Indeed, we humbly believe, that what are called philosophical historians, have of late years done much mischief by giving their own conjectures, instead of the record of facts. A passage which is just under our eye, confirms us in this notion, whilst it fully explains our mind.

The sixth volume contains a letter from the chaplain of the Abnakis, warriors who formed part of the army which attacked Fort George; and of the surrender of which, and the calamitous scene that followed, Mr. Cooper has given so striking a description in his novel of the "Last of the Mohicans." We must acknowledge that we prefer the chaplain's recital, and suspect that the novelist also has read the narrative which lies before us.

The Indian canoes had come to, under cover of a point of land, by doubling which they would have been fully in view of the fort, to the attack of which they were advancing with considerable precaution; here they were to remain for the night; the chaplains of three Indian divisions were in one canoe. Our informant writes:

"About eleven o'clock, two barges from the fort made their appearance upon the lake. They sailed with such apparently calm consciousness of safety, that they were approaching to where we lay. One of my neighbours, who watched for the general safety, observed them at a considerable distance. The news was communicated to all the savages, and the preparations for receiving them were made with admirable promptness and silence. I was immediately summoned to provide for my safety by going ashore and keeping in the wood. It was not from an exhibition of bravery, unbecoming a man of my state, that I turned a deaf ear to the advice which was so generously offered; but I could not believe it was seriously given, since I thought I had excellent reasons to suspect the truth of the news. Four hundred boats and canoes, which, during two days, had covered the waters of the Lake of the Holy Sacrament, must have formed too considerable an exhibition to escape the attentive and clear eyes of an enemy. Upon this principle, I could scarcely persuade myself that two barges would have the rashness, I will not say to enter into combat with, but to present themselves before such a superior force; I was philosophizing, where I had only to open my eyes."

We suspect that there is great injury done to the cause of truth by too much philosophism, and too little viewing of fact; and, therefore, we here shall content ourselves chiefly with gleaning matter, upon which our readers can reason as well as we can.

In the pursuit of these barges and their capture, one Indian was

killed, and another wounded. The chaplain gives us the following account of the interment of the former:

"Scarcely did dawn commence, before a party of the Nipistinguian nation proceeded to the ceremonial obsequies of their brother slain in the action of the preceding night, and deceased in the errors of paganism. These obsequies were celebrated with all the pomp and show of the savages, the body having been decked in all its ornaments, or rather overloaded with all the attire which the most original vanity could bring to bear under circumstances of the most melancholy nature. Collars of porcelain, bracelets of silver, decorations and pendants of the ears and nose, and splendid dresses, all had been most prodigally heaped on; the aid of paint especially of vermilion, had been so given, that the paleness of death might disappear under the effect of these showy colours, and the countenance have the appearance of that life which it did not possess. None of the decorations of the Indian soldier were forgotten; a neck-piece, tied with a fire-coloured ribbon, hung carelessly on his breast; his rifle lay on his arm, the tomahawk at his girdle, his calumet in his mouth, a spear in his hand, and a full kettle at his side: in this warlike posture he was placed sitting on an eminence covered with turf, which formed his bed of state. The savages ranged around the body in a circle, preserved for some time a mournful silence, which had all the appearance of grief. This was broken by the orator who pronounced the funeral oration; then followed songs and dances, accompanied with the music of the tabor and bells. In all this there was something of an indescribable lugubrity, which was well adapted to a melancholy ceremonial. The whole ended by the burial of the dead, after which care was taken to bury also a good quantity of provisions, doubtless, to guard against the possibility of his dying a second time by hunger. I do not relate this as an eye-witness; the presence of a missionary would badly comport with ceremonies of this sort, dictated by superstition, and adopted by stupid credulity. I have my information from those who saw it."

We are sorry that the chaplin should have attempted a witticsim instead of making an inquiry; and it would be interesting to us to learn the object of this interment of the provisions. We suspect the reverend gentleman did speculate against fact on more occasions than where English barges were in question. To play off wit or its semblance against a religious rite can never lead to information, but to inquire of those who are qualified to explain, might conduct to useful knowledge. The missionary would have done no harm by his attending to observe, and might have aided our investigation into the nature of the Indian religion, by having asked a few questions. But though we cannot approve of his speculation, we must applaud his candour; and we are always gratified by having the distinction drawn by the witness himself between his conjecture and his knowledge.

Father Gabriel Marest, of whom we made previous mention as chaplain to Iberville's expedition, was a Jesuit missionary, subsequently stationed at Kascaskias, a village of the Illinois tribe, and named as the station of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. A letter

written by him to Father Gernon, of the same society, on the 9th of November, 1712, describes with great accuracy the site and course of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, and the Wabash rivers, as also the productions of the land, and much of the natural history; he next gives the character of the inhabitants, and proceeds:

"It would be hard to say what is the religion of our savages; it consists only in some superstitions by which their credulity is amused. As all their knowledge is confined to that of beasts and the wants of life, so too is their worship bounded by these objects. Some charlatans, who have a little more mind than the rest, procure their respect by their capacity for deceiving them. They persuade them to honour a sort of genius to which they give the name of Manitou; and, according to them, it is this genius which governs all things, and which is the master of life and death. A bird, an ox, or rather the plumage of birds, or the skin of a beast, is their Manitou; they exhibit it in their huts, and they offer to it sacrifices of dogs or of other animals.

"The warriors carry their Manitous in mats, and they perpetually invoke them to obtain victory over their enemies; the charlatans have likewise recourse to their Manitous, when they compound their medicine, or that they may heal their patients. They accompany their invocations with chaunts, dances, and frightful contortions, to create the belief that they are agitated by their Manitous; and they at the same time so shake the patient as frequently to cause his death. In those various contortions, the charlatan names sometimes one beast, sometimes another; then proceeds to suck that part of the patient's body in which he feels most pain; after having sucked for some time, he runs on a sudden and casts out the tooth of a bear, or of some other animal, which he had concealed in his mouth. 'My dear friend,' he cries, 'you have life, behold what was killing you.' After which, applauding himself, he cries out, 'Who can resist my Manitou? Is he not the master of life and death?' Should the patient die, some pretext is ready to cast the blame of death upon some other cause which occurred after his departure from the patient; but if the sick person recovers, then the juggler is held in esteem, is himself considered as a Manitou, and, after having been well paid for his trouble, the best things in the village are brought to regale him."

Another passage in the letter exhibits to us the grounds upon which we are fully warranted in calling their worship idolatrous. Idolatry is the giving to any created being the worship of adoration which is due to God alone. The person who acknowledged the existence of only one God, and paid to him adoration under any name by which he might be designated, would not be an idolater, because the object of his adoration was the supreme and only God. The person who believed the divinity to reside in a statue or image, and therefore made that statue or image the object of his adoration, would be an idolater; but if he viewed that image as it really was, not divine, nor partaking of the divinity, nor having any inherent sanctity, but a mere memorial by which his attention was awakened, his imagination fixed, and his religious feeling excited, and that in its presence he adored the eternal and spiritual God,

and him alone, clearly he was not an idolater—for though, by occasion of the creature, he was brought to the adoration of the Creator, he adored God, and him alone. Thus he who, filled with the piety which nature excites, raises himself from the contemplation of a flower, or the consideration of the solar system, to the adoration of Him who gave to the one its delicate tints, and to the other its admirable order and wondrous harmony, is not the adorer of nature, but of nature's God. He who pays the homage of adoration to created beings, however intelligent and superior they may be, whether they be holy or wicked, gives to the creature that which is due to the Creator alone, and is thus an idolater: thus, the worshippers of Mars, of Juno, of Ceres, and the other deities of Greece and Rome, gave to created beings the homage of adoration, and were idolaters; and though they should never have represented, by statues or paintings, those objects of their homage, the crime would have been fully committed; the adoration of those demons, by occasion and in presence of the image, was still the undue worship of creatures—and they who were so far besotted as to adore the statue itself, were, if possible, more criminal. The adhering to this idolatry so far as to withdraw its votaries from the adoration of the only and true God, would have been the consummation of this apostacy, and such was the state of the Indians of whom we treat. The Manitou is not considered as an intercessor with God, as a fellow-worshipper with man of the Deity,—but is the object of adoration, the lord of life and of death. Father Marest informs us:

"The French having established a fort on the river Wabash, demanded a missionary, and Father Mermet was sent to them. This father thought it to be his duty to labour also for the conversion of the Mascoutens, who had constructed a village on the bank of the same river. This nation understands the Illinois language, but was so devoted to the superstitions of its jugglers, as to have no disposition to hear the instructions of the missionary.

"Father Mermet resolved to confound in their presence one of the charlatans who used to adore the ox as his Manitou. Having insensibly brought him to acknowledge that the ox itself was not the object of his adoration, but a Manitou of the ox which was under ground, and which animated all oxen, and gave life to the sick; the father asked him whether other beasts, such for instance as the bear, which some of his brethren used to adore, were not likewise animated by Manitous which were under ground. 'Doubtless,' replied the juggler. 'But if so,' said the missionary, 'men also ought to have their Manitou by which they are animated.' 'Nothing more certain,' said the juggler. 'I want no more,' replied the missionary, 'to show you how unreasonable is your conduct; for if a man who is upon the earth is the master of all animals,—if he slays them,—if he eats them, the Manitou that animates man must be the master of all other Manitous. Where, then, is your sense not to invoke him who is the master of the rest.' This reasoning disconcerted the juggler, but produced no other effect; for they continued no less attached than before to their ridiculous superstition."

After these extracts no doubt remains upon our mind of the idolatrous character of the Indian religious practices. We are accustomed indeed to hear and to read of the Great Spirit, and attempts have been made to prove that the red wanderer in our deserts was a pure theist and one who, if he worshipped at all, adored God, who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth. We have here adduced but a few particular facts; were they all that we possessed, our conclusion would be too extensive for our premises, and our deduction would be of course unwarranted because unsustained; but these few are only a specimen of many analogous accounts which make the foundation sufficiently large to uphold our superstructure. They exhibit adoration paid to created beings, whether the plumage or skin, or the genius which animated the creature whose spoils were thus held sacred, matters little, and they who paid this homage, were thereby withdrawn from the adoration of the true and only God, the creator of angels, of men, and of beasts; and this was perfect idolatry. If each Manitou was the giver of life and death, each had the attribute which is essentially that of the divinity, and we discover not only idolatry but polytheism to be fairly chargeable upon the aborigines of our states.

This position is confirmed by the relation of another occurrence. An epidemic having broken out amongst the Indians, their jugglers zealously endeavoured to appease their deity.

"Meantime the jugglers removed to a short distance from the fort to offer a grand sacrifice to their Manitou. They immolated as many as forty dogs, which they placed on the ends of poles, singing and dancing, and making a thousand extravagant postures. Notwithstanding this the mortality did not cease. The principal juggler took up the notion that their Manitou being more feeble than the Manitou of the French, was obliged to yield to him. Under this impression, he made several circuits round the fort, crying with all his might. 'We are dead: sweetly, Manitou of the French, strike us lightly, do not kill us all.' Then addressing the missionary, 'Stop, good Manitou, permit us to live, you have life and death in your chest, let death remain there, give out life.'"

The best evidence of adoration is the offering of sacrifice, which is the highest act of religion. The best evidence of polytheism is the undetermined contest between deities, or the victory of one over the other. They who believe in such a contest or such a victory must by polytheists.

Amongst the letters which enter most in detail upon the subject of the belief and ceremonial of the Indians, we may place one written at New Orleans, on the 12th of July, 1730, by Father Petit, one of the missionaries, to Father d'Avangour, Procurator of the Missions of North America. He states that the tribe of the Natchez, though at that period considerably reduced, was one of the most powerful on the banks of

the Mississippi. We shall give in another place, a description of their temple and ceremonial; we desire at present only to remark his testimony of their adoration of the sun, and of a great number of idols which they had in temples; together with their preservation of a perpetual fire, and their carrying the idols with them to war, together with several superstitious rites upon various occasions.

One remark as to the probable origin of this people: Father Du Poisson, a Jesuit missionary amongst the Akensas, now Arkansas Indians, on the banks of the river which we denominate Arkansas, who writes from a town of that name, on the 3d of October, 1727, gives a most amusing description of his voyage up the Mississippi: he embarked on board a pirogue on the 25th of May, accompanied by two other missionaries, Father Souel for the Yatous or Yazoos, and Father Dumas for the Illinois; they were to be followed immediately by Father de Guienne for the Alibamons, and Father Petit for the hunting grounds. Though we have already made several digressions, we hope to be excused for giving a few stages of the progress of the letter-writer, that a comparison might be thus made between what is now done upon that river with what was a grand effort a century ago. Soon after losing sight of New Orleans, they were nearly wrecked by a snag, and had to remain at Chapitulas with M. Dubriel, a Parisian, who had taken up a concession on the father of rivers; this delayed them until the 29th, on which day they advanced two leagues, and partook of a carp which weighed over thirty pounds; heavy and reiterated charges are made against mosquitoes, gallinippers, and every other species of fly; the good father doubts whether Pharaoh was more afflicted by *omne genus muscarum.* Gad-flies and wasps appear to have been more formidable to the voyagers than Don Cossacks and Kalmuc Tartars were to the good people of Paris, in 1815. On the night of June 2d, they got beds at the concession of the Messrs. Paris, at Bayagoulas: on the 4th, they lodged at Baton Rouge, so called from a post painted red, which divided the hunting grounds of the upper and lower Indians: on the 7th, at Point Coupée: on the 13th, they arrived at Natchez, and were entertained by Father Philibert, a Capuchin friar, who was the parish priest. It was in this place Father Du Poisson learned the fact to which we desire to draw the attention of our readers, namely, the custom amongst the Natchez, which has been also testified by several other missionaries, that upon the death of their chief a considerable number of male and female attendants are willingly immolated for the purpose of attending him in the next world. The French settlers vainly endeavoured to put a stop to the practice. The Natchez state that their great ancestors came over

the seas to this continent; and Father Du Poisson informs us that persons better acquainted than he was with their customs and usages, give them a Chinese origin. We have to repeat our regret that the special grounds of these opinions have not reached us.

Leaving Natchez on the 17th of June, our travellers arrived at the mouth of the Yazoo river on the 23d, which was nearly a month from the day of their departure; here Father Souel remained, and on the 26th, Father Du Poisson departed for his station, and arrived at the lower branch of the Arkansas River, on the 7th of July.

As it is very probable that the aboriginal inhabitants of both our continents had a common ancestry, it will be as well that we should now extend our view to the south, as we have gone over a portion of the north. Our object shall be in the first instance to examine the nature and number of deities worshipped, next the rites used in that worship, especially on public occasions, and then the other practices of superstition. Before entering upon our examination we cannot avoid remarking a singular discovery which was made about the year 1731, near the mouth of the river Ouyapoc, in French Guiana; in digging for the foundations of the first church which was to be built in that place, and which was erected and dedicated in 1731, there was found in the soil, at the depth of four or five feet, a small medal greatly rusted, which when cleaned exhibited an image of St. Peter, the Apostle. Father Lombard, the superior of the Jesuit missions amongst the Indians of Guiana, mentions the fact in a letter from Kourou in that province, on the 11th of April, 1733, to Father Neuville of the same society, procurator of those missions in France, and offers to send the medal if it should be considered worth inspection by any of the learned antiquarians of that country; he also remarks upon the extraordinary character of the fact, since the Indians had neither money nor medals, and the piece appeared to him to be of the earliest ages of Christianity, nor was it known that any Christian had ever lived in that country. Another statement, in a letter of Father Jerom Herran, a Spanish Jesuit and procurator of the missions of Paraguay, might perhaps be placed in juxtaposition with this; Father Herran's letter is compiled from a memoir drawn up in Spanish by Father John Patrick Fernandez, of the same society, and presented to the Prince of Asturias, in 1726, in which, describing the religion of some of the Indians, he gives it as his opinion that in the midst of their gross fables and superstitions might be discerned many traces of the Christian religion, said to have been preached to their ancestors by St. Thomas, or some of his disciples. We shall not here enter into an examination of the probability of this continent having

been peopled from Asia, though long before the doubling of the Cape of Good Hope by the Portuguese; and of the migrations having been from that part of India where the Portuguese discovered the Jacobites, called latterly "Christians of St. Thomas," and that this medal and some of those customs which Father Fernandez describes, might have thus found their way to South America; we shall see abundant evidence of many religious ceremonies similar to those of Persia and India, having been in existence amongst our tribes. Father Fauque, however, one of the French missionary Jesuits in Guiana, conjectures from a variety of their customs that they are of Jewish descent; and he relates one fact upon the statement of which he takes occasion to mention his opinion. The Palikours, of whom he writes, were a tribe on the borders of the river Ouyapoc; and the Galibis were upon the same river, but at some distance.

"Having gone into a high hut which in the Galibi we call soura, I at once perceived a cadaverous smell; and as I mentioned my surprise, I found that persons were disinterring the bones of one who was dead and which they were to carry to another country, and at the same time showed me a sort of urn which contained the remains. I recollected that about three or four years previously, I had seen in this same place two Palikours who had come to seek the bones of one of their deceased relatives: as I then omitted questioning them upon the subject, I now did, and the Indians told me that it was the custom of their nation to remove the bones of the dead to the place of their birth, because they looked upon it to be their true and only country. This usage is in perfect conformity with the conduct of Joseph respecting his father Jacob: and I will say, by the way, that we remark amongst these nations so many customs of the Jewish people, that one cannot avoid believing them to be their descendants."

We regret much that the good father did not prefer giving an enumeration of facts to mere general opinion, for we must confess, that as yet we feel much less disposed to come into his conclusion, than if we saw more substantial grounds upon which it might rest. We are quite prepared to receive his testimony as respects facts observed by himself, but we must be excused from adopting his opinions merely because he says there is good reason for their support. We have other, and what appears to us better testimony to maintain their Chinese descent. And if we were to hazard a conjecture upon what we have seen of the Asiatic and American researches, we should feel greatly disposed to believe with Sir William Jones, that they are of Hindoostan origin, perhaps after an intermediate residence in China. This would be in a great measure supported by the statement of Father Du Poisson as referred to above.

We now proceed to inquire concerning the religious practices of the South American Indians, and so forth.

One of the best remarks that we recollect to have met within these

letters on the subject of our present inquiry, is contained in one written by Father Cat, a Jesuit Missionary from Buenos Ayres, on the 18th of May, 1729.

"To undertake painting for you manners which would equally characterize all the savage people of India would be to attempt an impossibility. You conceive that usages and customs vary to infinity, I shall therefore content myself with giving you what appears to me the most universally established amongst them."

He then draws a line of distinction between tribes perfectly barbarian, and nations considerably advanced in civilization. He shows that Mexico and Peru appear to have been already civilized, and therefore the accounts given of them by Las Casas, exhibit a mild and amiable race of men, whilst the savage of Paraguay was debauched, dissolute, ungovernable, and negligent. After extending those remarks, and exemplifying his positions, he proceeds to give a general idea of their religion:—

"The Roman orator has said that in no part of the world does there exist a people that does not recognize a Supreme Being and pay to him homage. This is perfectly verified amongst certain tribes of Paraguay; a stupid and barbarous race, some of whom in truth do not pay any homage to God, yet are persuaded of his existence, and fear him greatly. They are equally convinced that the soul does not perish with the body, at least I judge so from the care with which they bury their dead. They place near them provisions, a bow, arrows and a club, so that in the next world they might be able to procure subsistence, and not be induced through hunger to return to this world to torment the living. This principle, universally received amongst the Indians, is of great use to lead them to the knowledge of God. In other respects, there are but few of them who care much what will happen to the soul after death."

"The Indians give to the moon the title of mother, and pay to her due honour as such; when she is eclipsed, you might see them come in crowds from their huts yelling and shouting dreadfully, and shooting a vast number of arrows into the air to guard this star of the night against the dogs which they believe have seized upon her, to tear her to pieces. Many nations in Asia, though civilized, look upon the eclipses of the moon very nearly in the same way as do our American savages. When it thunders, these nations think that the storm is raised by the soul of some deceased enemy who thus wishes to avenge the shame of his defeat. The Indians are very superstitious in their inquiries into future events; they chiefly consult the singing of birds, the cry of some beasts, and the changes of trees: these are their oracles, and they suppose that from them they can obtain certain knowledge of untoward accidents with which they are threatened."

We find in a letter written by Father Stanislas Arlet, a Bohemian Jesuit, to the general of his order, in 1698, September 1st, from the Peruvian province in the latitude of 14 deg. south, and in the Spanish government of Moxos, an account of the aborigines who wandered near the river which they called Cucurulu, and in a country which they called Canisi. After describing them as barbarians who went perfectly naked,

and had no fixed habitation, no laws nor form of government, he states of their religion, that although they had sufficient notions of a supreme being, they did not appear to worship either God or the devil; they were given to drunkenness, and exhibited in their conduct all the bad consequences which this vice produces upon a barbarous people with unrestrained passions: yet from his account there was much less difficulty than usual in bringing them to Christianity. In consulting an ancient map of the missions of the Moxos under charge of the Jesuits, we have been enabled to fix the spot where Father Arlet built his church of St. Peter, at a little less than 14 deg., about twenty miles east of the river Mamore, one of the head streams of the Madeira, a principal tributary of the Amazon.

A question would naturally appear to present itself. If this was part of Peru, or in its vicinity, how shall we reconcile the favourable account which we have of the Peruvians to this statement of the Bohemian Jesuit? In the first place, the entire range of country now known as Peru and Chili, together with the United Provinces of South America, was all known as the province of Peru, and the character of its inhabitants was first designated from that of the portion which occupied the seaboard of the Pacific; secondly, the province of Cusco, though an interior division of Peru, is separated from the territory of Moxos, by the territory of La Paz, from which latter it is also divided by the high and craggy Andes of Chuchon, and the river Beni on the northeast, and on the southeast by the lake Titiaca or Chucuito, which cut off their intercourse: and thirdly, the usual ingress into the territory of Moxos, was by the pass of Santa Cruz de la Sierra, in the present Province of Cochamba, until after several heroic efforts, which had nearly cost him his life, Father Cyprian Baraza, a Spanish Jesuit, who might properly be called the founder of this mission, discovered a trail over the Andes, passing several Cordilleras, by which he understood from the Indians that some Spaniards under Quiroga had begun to open a passage many years previous. This was about the year 1695. From Peru to the stations of Father Baraza, on the right bank of the river Mamore, was now but a journey of fifteen days, and this discovery was viewed as a junction of two nations which had previously no intercourse save by a circuit of several months' journey: hence the one might be well civilized, and the other perfectly barbarian. Father Baraza had proceeded from Santa Cruz de Sierra, in a northerly direction to the 15th degree of latitude, establishing his missions; and after this new pass was discovered, the two Bohemians, Fathers Arlet and Borina, were sent, in 1697, by the new passage,

to a more northerly place to found a new mission, and fell in with the Canisi, whose station they fixed at St. Peter's.

We shall now advert to the testimony of Father Cyprian Baraza and his associates, for we will call it such, though it be not written by him but by them. The extracts which we make, and the testimony which we advance are from "an abridgment of a Spanish account of the life and death of Father Cyprian Baraza, of the society of Jesuits, and founder of the mission of the Moxos in Peru; printed at Lima by order of the Right Rev. Nicholas Urban de Matha, Bishop of La Paz, 1704." In the year 1705, Father Nyel, a French Jesuit, wrote on the 20th of May, from Lima to Father la Chaise, confessor to the King of France, an account of his voyage from St. Malo, together with several other missionaries bound to China, but who in consequence of the danger of capture by the British or Dutch, preferred taking the western passage to this most eastern part of the Asiatic continent: another letter of his written six days later to Father Dez, rector of the college of Strasburg, gives amongst others an account of the missions of the Moxos. In it he mentions that he has sent to Father Gobin the history of Father Baraza, who had been martyred two years and a half before, which history he says "was printed at Lima by order of one of the most holy and enlightened prelates of Peru." Our readers will now be able to form some opinion of the value of its statements:—

"There is not amongst the Moxos either law, or government, or regulation: if any difference arises between individuals, each person seeks to do himself justice; there is no one who commands, nor does any one obey."

. . . . . .

"They have no regular time for their meals; when they can find anything to eat, it is an excellent hour for the repast. But as their food is coarse and insipid, they seldom are guilty of excess; but they well know how to make up for it in their drink. They have found the secret of making a very strong liquor with an infusion of some rotted roots which they decompose in water. This liquor quickly intoxicates, and drives them to the last excess of madness. They chiefly use it on festivals which they celebrate in honour of their gods. At the noise of instruments, whose sound is very disagreeable, they assemble under bowers which they form by intertwining the branches of trees; and there confusedly dance through the day, and swill long draughts of this inebriating beverage. These festivals generally end in a tragical and indecent manner."

. . . . . .

"The only alleviation which they obtain in sickness, consists in calling certain enchanters who they imagine have received a special power to heal them. These jugglers visit the sick, repeat some superstitious prayer over them, promise to fast for their cure, and to smoke tobacco for them a certain number of times every day; or, what is a special favour, they suck the part affected, after which they withdraw, but always well paid."

. . . . . .

"All the people of this country live in a profound ignorance of the true God. There are amongst them some who adore the sun, the moon, and the stars; others adore the rivers; some worship a pretended invisible tiger; some others always carry with them a great number of little ridiculous idols. But they have no dogma which is an object of their belief; they live without any hope of future reward, and if they perform any act of religion, it by no means flows from love; fear alone is its principle. They imagine that in everything there exists a spirit which sometimes is angry with them, and sends upon them the evils with which they are afflicted, hence their chief care is either to avoid offending, or to appease this secret power, which they say it is impossible to resist. They do not exhibit any solemn external form of worship, and amongst so many tribes, only one or two can be discovered who use any kind of sacrifice. There exist amongst the Moxos, however, two descriptions of ministers of religion; some might be truly called enchanters, whose only function is to restore the sick to health; others are like priests, destined to appease the gods. The first are not elevated to this grade of honour until after a rigorous fast of a year, during which they abstain from flesh and fish: besides, they must have been wounded by a tiger, and escaped from his claws; they are then revered as men of rare virtue, as it is believed they are respected and favoured by the invisible tiger who has protected them from the efforts of the visible one which they have combated.

"When they have during a long time discharged the duties of this office, they are raised to the priesthood, but to render them worthy of this, they must fast during another year with the same rigour, and their abstinence must have given them sad and emaciated countenances; then the juice of certain herbs, which are very pungent, is extracted and spread over their eyes, by which they are greatly tortured, and thus the sacerdotal character is imprinted upon them; they pretend that their vision is made more clear by this, and hence their priests are called Tiharaugui, or 'he who has clear eyes.'

"At particular periods of the year, and especially about the time of new moon, these ministers of Satan assemble the people upon some hill, not far from their village. From early dawn the people go in silence towards this spot, but when arrived there, they break out into frightful yells, to mollify, as they say, the hearts of their divinities: the day passes away in fasting and shouting, and at nightfall, they conclude by the following ceremonial:—Their priests commence by cutting off their hair, which is amongst them a sign of joy, and then cover their bodies with red and yellow feathers; large vessels are then produced, into which the inebriating beverage, prepared for the solemnity, is poured; this is received by them as a first-fruit offering to their gods, and having drank abundantly, they leave it to the people, who following their example, swallow down unmeasuredly: the night is employed in drink and dance; one intones, the rest form a circle around, mark time with their feet, carelessly loll their head from side to side, with indecent gestures; this is their whole dance; and those who are most foolish and extravagant in this exhibition are considered the most religious and devout. The rejoicings usually terminate in the wounds or death of several. They have some knowledge of the immortality of the soul, but this light is so obscured by the dark clouds amidst which they live, that they do not even suspect anything of future rewards and punishments; and, therefore, scarcely give themselves any concern about what will happen after death."

We have taken this extract pretty fully and at some length, as the

result of the observations of Father Baraza and his companions, as well to confirm as to explain the testimonies of Fathers Cat and Arlet: these two latter wrote their letters within the second year of their acquaintance with these people, and might not have been sufficiently acquainted with their customs to know in which of the ceremonials that fell under their observation, the public worship consisted; whereas, in the other body of witnesses, we have the close observation of persons who resided twenty years amongst the people whose religion they describe. Father Cyprian Baraza was slain by the Bauros, the last tribe which he undertook to instruct, on the 16th of September, 1702, at the age of sixty-one years; upwards of twenty-seven of which he had lived amongst those people. Hence he had a better opportunity of knowing the fact of their adoration and its mode. The Canisians, described by Father Arlet, and some of the tribes of Paraguay, mentioned by Father Cat, might have resembled the Guarayens described in the history of Father Baraza. After describing the Cirioniens, amongst whom he made a mission:

"The missionary remained some time amongst them, and it was in going through their different abodes he obtained knowledge of a nation called that of the Guarayens. This tribe made itself formidable to all the others by its natural ferocity, and the custom which it has of eating human flesh. They hunt men in like manner as others do game, and take them alive if possible; they then carry them about, and kill them as they are hungry. They have no fixed residence, for they say that they are continually terrified by the lamentable cries of those souls whose bodies they have eaten. Thus roaming and wandering through all those regions, they spread abroad terror and consternation."

Father Cyprian accompanied by some neophytes, met a few of this tribe, and with some exertion saved their lives from the justice of his disciples. Grateful for this kindness, these savages introduced him to their tribe, which he was anxious to visit: he was received with great marks of affection; he preached against their cannibal practice, and procured from them a promise to abstain from it thenceforward; but the sequel proved how soon such an obligation was forgotten. On a subsequent occasion he found amongst them seven young Indians as a stock of provisions: he besought them with tears, not to repeat their crimes, and they gave him the most solemn assurances that they would desist: upon his return from a short excursion, he was horror-stricken at seeing the ground covered with the bones of four of the wretches, and the other three still kept in store; he procured their release, took them to one of his settlements, and he and they subsequently brought, one after another, a large portion of those savages to become incorporated with Christian tribes.

In a letter written from Conception, in Chili, by Father Labbé, a

Jesuit, to another of the same name in Europe, on the 8th of January, 1712, an account is given of the edifying conduct of the Christian Indians in Paraguay, and of some of the unconverted tribes: these latter he calls idolaters, though he does not mention the specific mode of their worship nor its object. But having lain, during some months of the previous year, at anchor, off the island of St. Gabriel, at the confluence of the Uraguay and Parara, where they form the Rio de la Plata, he had an opportunity of noticing some of the tribes of that vicinity. The following extract is of a singular character:

"Before our departure, Indians of another caste came to see us; they are mostly idolaters, warlike and dreaded through all South America. A custom exists amongst these people which was to us a matter of great surprise. They are in the habit of killing all the females who survive the age of thirty years. They had brought one with them who was only twenty-four; and one of these Indians told me that she was very old, and had not a long time to live, as in the course of a few years they should slay her. Our fathers have converted several of this caste to the faith, and it were to be desired for the sake of the females that they could all be converted."

We find in some of these letters, accounts of nations where, when the mother had twins, one was slain, as it would occupy the attention of the nurse too much to have the care of both. We have read in others, accounts of the slaying of aged men in certain tribes, as an act of piety to release them from want and suffering, when they could no longer hunt or fish; but this is the only instance that we recollect of a custom of shortening, and to so limited a period, the lives of females. Could we collect together the various barbarities which Christianity has destroyed; could we calculate the accumulated effects by multiplying ages and nations and destructive customs; could we add to this result, that of a similar multiplication of blessings which were its inevitable consequences; we might well cast away all the enjoyments of a world to come, and pointing to the mighty mass of destroyed evils and created good, say to those who have written or spoken of wars, persecutions, and other evils or crimes, which according to their allegation it has produced, and triumphantly ask, how much does the alleged evil fall short of the undoubted good? But this is not our theme.

There is a letter dated March 30, 1718, at Buenos Ayres, from Father James de Haze, a Belgian Jesuit, who had then spent thirty years in the province, twenty-two of which he had been amongst the Indians, and then, much against his inclination, was withdrawn from the missions to be placed at the head of the college of Paraguay. The letter is addressed to Father John Baptiste Arendts, provincial of Flanders. He describes amongst others, some tribes on the river Paraguay, particularly the Guaycureens, a very barbarous and ferocious nation; they are generally horse-

men, who without clothing for themselves, or saddles on their steeds, rove about the country; also the Paraguays, who principally lived on fish, and remained in their canoes on the river, a cruel and perfidious race, greatly opposed to Christianity, and of whose enmity and deceit he gives some melancholy instances. He writes—

"All these barbarians adore the devil, and they report that he appears to them occasionally under the figure of a large bird."

Father Fauque, of whom we made previous mention, writing from Ouyapoc, in French Guiana, on the 27th September, 1733, to Father Neuville, procurator of the American missions in France, relates a conversation which confirms the testimony here given by Father de Haze. He had gone out from Ouyapoc into some of the neighbouring settlements of the Palikours, and states—

"On Monday I left the river Tapamouru, and lay down at night in a thicket, on the banks of the Ouassa. I was obliged to sleep in the same place next night, for having gone to the middle of a creek which separated me from the other habitations, and finding it too deep, I was obliged to return. On Wednesday I arrived at the dwelling of an Indian named Coumarouma, who had invited me to visit him, and had even offered me ground to establish a mission; but the place is not at all so convenient as the height of Ouassa, which I previously mentioned. As this Indian had been to Kourou, and there witnessed the charity of the missionaries for their neophytes, we conversed for a long time upon the steps which might be taken to form a similar establishment in this vicinity. I said, among other things, that the Pyapes who are a sort of enchanters or magicians, were altogether driven from the mission of Father Lombard; and I knew of only one who was reputed to be of that description. I mentioned his name; he knew him, and being aware of his being blind of one eye, 'Whew,' said he laughing, 'is that fellow a Pyape? How could he see the devil with only one eye?' This witticism pleased me the more, as it confirmed what I already began to know, that the Palikours cannot bear these sort of jugglers."

However strange the assertions might seem at first to some of our readers, that those Indians on the Paraguay stated the apparition of the devil to them, yet when we find from the remark of our friend Coumarouma, that a monoptic was scarcely fit for the ministry because of the difficulty he must experience in seeing his Satanic majesty; we must be led to conclude that this belief was really prevalent amongst them, and when we discover it upon the Paraguay and in French Guiana, we find reason to suppose that it must have pervaded the intermediate country.

In a letter of the same Father Fauque, written nearly five years later, to the same superior, 20th of April, 1738, he is giving the account of his mission in company with Father Besson, to some new tribes more to the northwest, and after relating the great fervour and piety of the converted Indians of the settlement of St. Paul, where the tribes of Pir-

ious, Palanquas, and Macapas, had united with some of the Caranas, he proceeds—

"After having remained three days in this mission, we set out upon our journey, Father Besson and myself, each in his canoe. After the first day's passage, found one of the famous Pyapes, named Canori, who is held in great esteem amongst the Indians, and had the audacity, during a short absence of Father Dayma, to come to his mission of St. Paul's, and perform his superstitions all around the house which had been built lately for his lodging. I endeavoured to no purpose to learn what were his intentions. One can never draw the truth from persons of this description, who are long extensively accustomed to perfidy and falsehood. * *

"What gives influence to this sort of Pyapes, is the talent which they have of persuading the Indians, especially when they are attacked by any sickness, that they are favoured by a spirit much superior to the one that afflicts the patient; that they are ready to ascend to heaven, to call upon this benevolent spirit to drive off the malicious one, who is the sole author of the evils endured, but they generally make the good folk pay very highly, and beforehand, the expenses of their journey."

The Chiquitos ranged through a very extensive territory, stretching from that of the Moxos, which our readers will recollect joined Peru on the west, to the head waters of the Paraguay, comprehending not only the present government of Chiquitos, in the United Provinces, but a large portion of the province of Matto Grosso, in Brazil. In the beginning of the last century, Father Francis Burges, procurator-general of the Jesuits of Paraguay, made a report to the King of Spain of the state of the missions in that province and some of the neighbouring territory. We suspect that he writes of the Chiquitos, but must be construed in the same manner as we have treated Father Arlet's account of the Moxos.

"There is no nation, how barbarous soever it may be, that does not recognise some divinity. But as regards the Chiquitos, there is no vestige amongst them of any worship paid to anything visible or invisible, not even to the devil, of whom they are in great dread. Thus they live like beasts, without any knowledge of another life, having no God but their belly, and bounding all their happiness by the gratifications of the present life. For this reason they have been led to the complete destruction of the sorcerers, whom they looked upon as the greatest enemies of life; and at present, if one of them only dreamed that his neighbor was a sorcerer, it would be sufficient cause for taking away his life if he could. Yet they have not ceased to be very superstitious, especially as regards the singing of birds, which they observe with a most scrupulous attention; they augur evils from them, and thence often suspect that the Spaniards are about to make an irruption into their country; the sole apprehension of this is capable of making them fly far beyond the mountains; the children are separated from their parents, and the fathers regard their children no more than if they belonged to strangers. The bonds of nature, which are found even in the brute creation, do not appear to unite them; a father would sell his child for a knife or a hatchet; this causes great apprehension to our missionaries, that they may not succeed in placing this people in villages, because they must be humanized before they can be Christianized."

The description given in this place is not of a nation of atheists,

but of savages, who had cast away a mode of worship which they once practised, having found the leaders in this worship, the sorcerers, a curb upon their enjoyments; and though Father Arlet stated that their neighbours, the Moxos, had no worship, still we find that Father Cyprian Baraza, who had better opportunities of knowing, discovered that they had a form which he describes. This report states of them that they had no form of government or police; still, even this assertion must not be understood in its full latitude, for the writer qualifies it by the immediate addition of the statement "that in their assemblies they followed the advice of their ancients and their caciques;" and we are again told, that "the power of these latter is not transmitted to their children, but must be acquired by valour and merit." Hence, the want of government and policy is rather relative than absolute; and, in the very next passage, it is mentioned that polygamy is, in a measure, rendered necessary for the caciques, for the purpose of supporting their rank and dignity, by supplying a sufficient quantity of chichi, their intoxicating beverage, which is made by their wives; the measure of which, to meet the decent hospitality of a cacique, could not be brewed by less than two or three women. All this exhibits a degree of power and a subordination of rank. In another part of the report, we are informed that those caciques possess great influence.

"They know of but two modes of treatment in sickness: the first is to have the part in which they feel pain sucked by persons whom, on this account, the Spaniards call Chupadores; this function is discharged by the caciques, who are the principal persons of their nation, and who, on that account, assume great authority over the minds of this people. They ask a good many questions of the patient. 'Where do you feel pain?' 'Whither have you gone immediately before your sickness?' 'Have you spilled any chica?' [They make it a matter of great concern if any of this inebriating liquor is spilled.] 'Have you thrown away any of the flesh of the stag, or any piece of the turtle?' If the sick person acknowledges any of these things, 'It is all correct,' the physician answers; 'this is the cause of your death; the soul of the stag or of the turtle has entered you, for the purpose of avenging the outrage you have committed.' The physician begins to suck the part affected, and after some time he spits out some black matter; 'Behold,' he says, 'the poison which I have extracted from your body.' The second remedy to which they have recourse, is more in conformity with their barbarian custom: they kill the females whom they suspect to have been the cause of their sickness, and thus give to death a sort of tribute, by payment of which, they persuade themselves they will obtain an exemption."

We have alluded to these parts of the report, to show that the expression of their having no government must be restricted, for they have governors; and to show, that however limited their notions of another state might be, they were not altogether confined to ideas of this material world. We shall now quote another passage of the report, which testifies

a custom, similar to one exhibited to us by Father Baraza and his companions, as religious worship amongst the Moxos.

They received the name of Chiquitos or the diminished, from their habit of gliding like serpents, at full length, into their huts, which are small, low, and oven-like, made of straw, with a very small aperture close to the ground, for creeping in. This they have been forced to, for the purpose of endeavouring to avoid the musquitoes, by which they are dreadfully annoyed in the rainy season.

"They have, however, large houses, constructed with branches of trees, in which they lodge their sons who have attained fourteen or fifteen years of age, and who must no longer live with their parents; in these houses, too, they regale their guests with chica. These festivals last usually during three days and three nights, passed in eating and drinking. The contention is, who will drink most chica, with which they become so furiously drunk, that they immediately fall upon those from whom they have received any imaginary affront, and frequently these sort of rejoicings terminate in the death of some of these wretches."

Let our readers compare this with the account of the worship and festivals terminated by the chica, as described by Father Baraza, and he will, probably, be inclined to our opinion, that the Chiquitos and Moxos were not only neighbours in territory, but were allied in barbarity and worship.

The eastern part of Charcas and the northwestern portion of Paraguay, were occupied about a century since, as are now the United Provinces, by an extremely barbarous tribe, called, by the Spaniards, Chiriguanos: during more than a century previous to that period, several ineffectual attempts had been made by the missionaries to bring them to the faith, but they had firmly determined to reject all that the Jesuits could bring them, save the little presents by which sometimes it was sought to purchase their good-will; when voluntary distributions had been completed, those Indians frequently stripped the father of what formed his own little stock, even to his altar furniture and clothing, and more than once shed his blood; still the indefatigable society returned to the attack, and abundance of volunteers were found to go upon this forlorn hope. We have some account of this nation, in a letter written by Father Ignatius Chomè to Father Vanthiennen, from Tarija, on the 3rd of October, 1735. Tarija is a small town in the northeastern part of Potosi, upon a stream of the same name, which falls into the Rio Vermeiò, about the 22d degree of south latitude, and was then a missionary station, dedicated to St. Bernard, and a frontier Spanish post. Father Herran, the provincial, sent from this place three missionaries, who had arrived from the banks of the Uraguay, Fathers Lizardi and Pons, together with the letter writer, and after persevering, but unsuccessful

effort, they were withdrawn by the provincial. The letter gives an account of their mission; and towards its close, is a general description of this people, and some of their customs; it is to be observed, that these fathers dwelt for some time amongst them, and spoke their language. Father Chomé states that they have no divinities nor public worship; their females make a strong drink, with which they are frequently intoxicated. The following conversation occurred, he writes, between him and one of them:—Indian. "You give yourself a great deal of useless trouble; the Indians, shutting his hand, have their hearts closed like my fist." Missionary. "You deceive yourself; you do not say enough: their heart is more hard than a stone." Indian. "Neither more nor less; but then they are more clever than you think, and more cunning; there is no man, however sharp he may be, whom they will not deceive; unless, at least, he has precaution, and is greatly on his guard."

We shall now mention a few of their customs, which he testifies, from whose nature, and the analogy to what has previously fallen under our view amongst the other nations, we are of opinion that if the missionaries had had the same opportunity in this place as in the neighbouring tribes, they would have found a belief in one or more divinities and a species of worship:—

"They have no physicians, but one or two of the most aged in their villages; all the science of these quacks consists in puffing round the patient to blow away the disease. When I, at the first time, left Caya, one of the daughters of the captain was sick. Upon my return soon after, she was recovered. Being somewhat feverish, her mother strongly recommended to me to be blown upon by the doctor. She perceived that I ridiculed it as folly. 'Listen to me,' said she, 'my daughter was very sick when you went away from us, you find her in perfect health at your return. How has she been cured? Solely in consequence of having been blown upon.'"

This looks very like the power which the jugglers in other places claim, through the interference of their Manitous: if the blowing of any ordinary individual would answer the healing purpose, there would only be the appearance of expecting a natural effect from its proper cause; but when the sanitory puff is expected from only a special description of persons, it appears to be a recourse through that particular order of men to a supernatural power. This we take to be a clear evidence of a religious sentiment in the people amongst whom it is found. If it was evident revelation from heaven that the effect would be produced by the Almighty upon the performance of this ceremony, the belief would be faith, the expectation would be hope, the observance would be religion: but without this evidence it would be superstition, which is the religious principle misapplied.

The father relates that whilst he was at Caya he observed an Indian,

who worked at his hut with him, become very feeble and scarcely able to labour; this led to the inquiry if he was sick, "No," said the Indian, "it is only the consequence of fasting." Upon the missionary asking why he fasted, he stated that his wife had just been delivered of a child, and it was therefore unlawful for him to taste food or drink during three days. Father Chomè expostulated with him, and concluded by advising him to eat, that fasting might be useful for his wife but not for him, and the Indian seemed to think so too. We cannot but surmise that this custom, which was general in the tribe, is founded upon some superstitious belief, and regret that the missionary's curiosity did not lead him to make some inquiry, or if he did, that he has not given us the result.

When they perceive the approach of dissolution, they surround the bed of the dying for days previous, to pour forth their lamentations: the omission of which would be most painful to the patient, as it would be a token of disrespect: they bury their dead with great care; having first inurned the body they inter it in their dwelling; the women continue for months to visit thrice a day the spot of interment, to bewail the dead after the decease:

"They believe in the immortality of the soul, but without knowing what becomes of it hereafter, they imagine that after leaving the body it wanders in the briars and underwood of the forests round their villages, and go every morning in search of it, until tired of their fruitless inquiry they abandon the pursuit. They must have some idea of the metempsychosis, for whilst I was one day conversing with an Indian woman who had left her daughter at a neighbouring village, she was terrified at seeing a fox pass near us. 'Might not that,' said she, 'be my daughter's soul, who perhaps has died?'

"They draw a bad augury from the singing of certain birds, and particularly of one of an ash colour, not larger than a sparrow, which is called chochos. Should they begin a journey and hear it sing, they go no farther, but return immediately home. I recollect that one day, conversing with the captains of three villages and a great number of Indians, one of those chochos began to sing in a neighbouring wood; they were dumb and terrified, and the conversation was terminated."

He informs us that the sorcerers who are held in high estimation in other tribes will not be allowed amongst them, but are execrated. A few months before he visited Caya, four Indians, of the tribe of Sinindita, had been burned alive, upon the suspicion that the son of one of their captains died by their sorcery: and when the puffers cannot quickly blow away sickness, they are persuaded that the patient is bewitched. He concludes his letter by stating that he knows not how far he would be carried were he to enter into a detail of all the ridiculous superstitions of this nation. This we look upon to be evidence that they had a belief in the existence of one or more gods, and believed the interference of

those supernatural beings in human concerns, and frequently through the agency of man, by means of rites, or invocations, or covenant; and thus we believe they had religion, though the missionary could not exactly testify, in a satisfactory manner, in what it consisted.

Previously to his entering upon this mission, Father Chomè wrote from Buenos Ayres, on the 21st of June, 1732, to Father Vanthiennen; in that letter he gives the history of this nation, which we insert, as it will tend greatly to explain the origin of the neglect which he testifies; and also to exhibit the insufficiency of those grounds upon which some European writers have endeavoured, by means of this testimony, to establish the position, that since whole nations of atheists were discovered by the missionaries in South America, we must naturally conclude that the belief in the existence of a God is a human and political invention.

After describing the nation of the Guaraniens, to the east of the Paraguay, which consisted of thirty congregations, comprising one hundred and thirty-eight thousand souls, who, "by the fervour of their piety and the innocence of their manners remind us of the first ages of Christianity," he tells us a fact which would appear obvious, that, in a nation just emerged from barbarism, the ideas, through the senses, are those which are predominant and most permanent:

"But these people greatly resemble arid lands which need perpetual culture. That which does not strike their senses leaves but a slight impression on their minds; and on this account it is necessary to inculcate, unceasingly, upon them the truths of faith; and it is only by the assiduous care which is taken in their instruction that they are preserved in the practice of all Christian virtues."

Hence, too, we must naturally conclude that if the most irreligious portion of this nation, separated from the better part previously to their having received instruction, and through hatred to that instruction, and having made it a leading principle to destroy even those who taught the Indian worship, for the purpose of keeping aloof from religion of every description, emigrated from their country, very little public worship would be found amongst their children; yet it would not be a good logical consequence that their progenitors were atheists, and that the cunning of man introduced notions of a divinity. We have already shown that this nation of the Chiriguanos would not allow amongst them any of those magicians or enchanters who were the ministers of religion amongst other tribes. We now produce evidence to show that the remaining characteristics, above mentioned, belong to them. The account which Father Chomè gives in his letter from Buenos Ayres, previously to his going amongst them, he had learned on the mission which he had just left, that of the Guaraniens:

"To give you some idea of this nation I must go back. When the Guaraniens submitted to the Gospel, and formed into congregations by our first missionaries, began to be a numerous and fervent Christian people, there were amongst them some infidels whose ferocity could not be overcome, and who obstinately refused to open their eyes to the light of faith. These barbarians, fearing the anger of their countrymen whose example they refused to follow, resolved to abandon their native country, and search an asylum elsewhere; for this purpose they crossed the Paraguay, and, advancing into the country, fixed their habitation in the midst of the mountains.

"The nations into whose country they came felt distrust towards them, and after having deliberated upon the part they should take, whether to declare war against the strangers or permit them to live quietly in the mountains, they determined that, having been born under a scorching sun and migrating to a very cold region, they could not long withstand the rigours of so severe a climate, and would soon be miserably wasted away. Chiriguano, said they in their own language, the cold will destroy them; hence their name of Chiriguanos, which distinguishes them from the Guaraniens from whom they sprung, and whose country they desired to forget."

The conjectures of the council were baffled, the Chiriguanos multiplied, and in a few years amounted to over 30,000 souls; they were warlike, and by gradual inroads and boisterous assaults, got possession of the larger portion of the mountain region which spreads about the head waters of the Picolmaio and Parapiti, the upper streams of the Rio Mamore. Various efforts had been made by the Jesuits, the Dominicans, and the Augustinians to introduce the Gospel amongst these persons; but upon the same principles that they forsook their country and nation, they generally refused to hear the instructers, and having at one time allowed the Dominicans to form a missionary establishment, they after some time surrounded them at night, and massacred them and their converts, which caused an irruption of the Spaniards from Tarija into their country, who, in a few battles, slew 300 and made 1000 prisoners; after which this tribe, that before considered itself invincible, was greatly humbled, and besought peace, joining a request that Jesuit missionaries might be sent to them. This was but the insincere petition of a cunning, and hypocritical, and defeated foe: and it was under such circumstances that Father Chomè and his companions were received by them. We in like manner discover that those cannibals, of whom mention was made in a former page, were the descendants of refugee Indians who, having plundered and murdered, upon his return, a noble Portuguese, that first penetrated, in the reign of John II., from Brazil nearly to the country of the Peruvian Incas, fled to the mountains, dreading the vengeance of his countrymen. We have, perhaps, devoted too much of our space to expose the assertion that those nations in which there was no appearance of religion were the children of atheists, who preserved the belief of their fathers, and thus gave

evidence that the belief in the existence of God was an invention unknown to the children of nature; and to show that they were descended from nations who had divinities and worship which those abandoned men cast away and disregarded, as also that the practices of superstition which they retained were full proof of their belief in supernatural powers and the influence of those powers upon the affairs of men: and thus that even amongst those who appear to be upon the lowest scale of the human race there exists the evidence of religion. Father Chomè himself writes of the Chiriguanos, that "at their head are caciques, who are a sort of enchanters, given up to witchcraft and magical practices."

The following extract of a letter from Father Cat, written at Buenos Ayres, on the 18th of May, 1729, will explain the source of the caciques' power, and exhibit the foundation of the statements which we so often meet with, that there was no regular government amongst those tribes:

"These savages have no knowledge of kings or princes amongst them. In Europe it has been said that their government is republican; but those republics have nothing stable in their character: there are no positive laws nor fixed principles for their civil government, nor for the administration of justice. Every family believes itself absolutely free, and every Indian considers himself absolutely independent. Yet as the continual wars in which they are engaged with their neighbours, continually place their liberty in jeopardy, they have thence learned the necessity of forming a sort of society, and electing for themselves a chief, whom they call cacique, that is, captain or commander. They do not intend by making this choice to subject themselves to a master, but to select a father or protector, under whose guidance they desire to place themselves. To be elevated to this dignity it is necessary to have given striking examples of courage and valour. In the ratio of the fame of a cacique for brilliant exploits, his people increase in numbers, and sometimes one hundred and fifty families will be ranged under one captain.

"If we are to give credit to some of our ancient missionaries, there are amongst those caciques, magicians who know how to make their authority respectable by the practices which they employ to avenge themselves upon those who are discontented. Did they undertake to punish them openly by a regular mode of justice, their ranks would soon be thinned. Those impostors create the belief amongst the people that lions, tigers, and the most ferocious beasts are under their orders, to devour those who refuse obedience. They are more easily believed, as it happens, not rarely, that they whom the cacique has threatened, are seen to fall into wasting sickness, which is rather the consequence of poison astutely administered, than of fear which results from the threat.

"To arrive at the dignity of the cacique, the aspirants have usually recourse to some magician, who, after having rubbed them with the grease of certain animals, brings them to see the spirit of darkness by which he says he is inspired, and after which he names the cacique, to whom he enjoins always to preserve a profound veneration for the author of his promotion."

Thus the very mode of instituting a cacique exhibits the existence of a form of religion.

Perhaps it might not be amiss to state here a cause which contributed greatly to establishing in Europe exaggerated notions of the neglect of religious rites in South America. Some of the refuse of society in the old world were amongst the earliest adventurers upon the newly discovered shores of the south. Avarice, cruelty and deceit were prominent in their character, and the last two were made subservient to the first. A great object of the missionaries was the civilization of the aboriginal barbarians and the preservation of their rights as freemen: to aid them in this holy work, they besought the protection of the courts of Europe: but were opposed by the friends of those adventurers who frequently were the most powerful and influential families in the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal. Amongst other statements which they were instructed to make was one to which they were prompted, as the most likely to exclude the missionaries from all intercourse with the Indians. They averred that the savages were not human beings, but a subordinate species between men and brutes, and only fit to labour under the direction of men: that slavery was the state for which they were evidently designed by the Creator, and that they were incapable of receiving or benefiting by the Christian faith; for that they not only had no religion of their own, but were incapable of religion. To combat such a statement as this, emanating from so powerful a source, and maintained with astute and practised ingenuity by experienced and well-paid advocates, was not so easy a task as we may now imagine; for then America was a world in itself with which Europe was only beginning an imperfect intercourse, and we need not be astonished that the decision of the question was seriously referred to at Rome. The flippant writers who sneer at the ignorance of those that solemnly undertook to examine the question would, perhaps, had they lived at that period, have maintained the interests of the freebooters by whom it was raised:—and though Rome decided upon the petition of Juan De Garcez, Bishop of Hazcala, and others, *Indos ipos utpote veros homines, non solum Christianae fidei capaces decernimus et declaramus,* and so forth, and that they ought to be instructed and admitted to the sacraments; still their ignorance and irreligion and stupidity were published and magnified in Europe. An interesting reference to this circumstance may be found in the extract from the memorial delivered to the prince of Asturias, to which we before referred.

We now proceed to give a more accurate and detailed account of the religion of the great body of the South-American Indians. The

extract which we give is taken from the second letter containing an abstract of the memoir in the Spanish language, drawn up by Father John Patrick Fernandez, and presented to the prince of Asturias by Father Joseph Herran, procurator of the Jesuits for the province of Paraguay. After enumerating upwards of eighty tribes, he proceeds:—

"As regards the religion of those tribes, and the ceremonies which they observe, there is not in the entire of the West Indies,[28] a more superstitious people. Nevertheless, through the gross and ridiculous fables, and the monstrous doctrines which place them in subjection to the devil, one cannot avoid discovering some traces of the true faith, which according to the common opinion, had been preached to them by St. Thomas or his disciples,[29] it even would appear that they had some confused idea of the coming of Jesus Christ incarnate for the redemption of men.

"They have a tradition, that in past ages, a very beautiful lady conceived a very fine infant, without any intercourse with man, that this infant being arrived at a certain age, wrought great prodigies, which filled the whole world with admiration; that he healed the sick, raised up the dead, made the lame to walk, gave sight to the blind, and wrought a number of other marvellous works which are far above human power; that one day, having assembled a great multitude of people, he raised himself into the air and transformed himself into that sun which we now see. 'His body,' say the mapono or priests of idols, 'is all luminous, and if the distance between him and us was not so great we could distinguish the features of his countenance.'

"It would appear very natural that so great a personage should be the object of their worship; yet they adore only devils, and they say that they sometimes appear to them in horrible forms. They recognise a trinity of principal gods, which they distinguish from the other deities who have less authority; to wit, the father, the son, and the spirit. They call the father Omequeturiqui, or Urago-Zorizo; the name of the son is Urasana; and the spirit is called Uropo. The virgin whom they call Quipoci is the mother of the god Urasana, and the wife of Urago-Zorizo. The father speaks distinctly with a loud voice; the son speaks through his nose; and the spirit like thunder. The father is the god of justice and punishes the wicked; the son, the spirit and the goddess discharge the functions of mediators and intercede for the guilty.

"A large hall of the house of the cacique serves as the temple of the gods. One part of this hall is closed by a great curtain; this is the sanctuary in which those three divinities who have the common appellation to each of Tinimaacas, come to receive the homage of the people and to publish their oracles. No one but the principal mapono can enter this sanctuary, for in every village there are two or three other subalterns, who are forbidden under pain of death to approach it.

"It is generally at the time of their public assemblies that those gods come to their sanctuary. A great noise which rings through the house announces their arrival;

[28] This name was then given by the Spaniards to the entire of the continent and islands at this side of the Atlantic.

[29] St. Thomas was said to have preached to the people of India, where he was put to death; but India was certainly not this India, and we doubt very much that the Apostle or any of his disciples crossed the Pacific; so that if the good father meant to say that it was the common opinion that the preaching was in this India, it is to us quite an amusing novelty which we do not recognise as a common opinion. We would not however quarrel with him for meaning that their remote ancestors had heard the Apostle or his disciples in the other India, *i. e.* East India.

the people, who now pass their time in drinking and dancing, interrupt their gratifications, and shout vehemently to show their joy, and to honour the presence of their deities. Tata equieep, say they, that is 'Father, are you arrived?' They hear a voice which answers Panitoques, that is 'be of good cheer, my children;' as if to say, 'continue to drink well, to eat well, to enjoy yourselves well, you cannot give me greater pleasure; I am very careful of you: it is I who procure for you all the benefits you derive from hunting and from fishing; and from me you derive all the good which you possess.'

"After this answer which the people hear with great respect in silence they return to their dances, and the chica which is their drink; and their heads being soon warmed by their excessive potations, the festival ends by quarrels, wounds, and often by the death of several.

"The gods are thirsty in their turn, and want drink. Vases ornamented with flowers are prepared, and the man and woman most respected in the village are selected to present their drink: the mapono, lifts a corner of the curtain, and receives the beverage for the purpose of carrying it to the gods, for he only is their confident, and he alone has a right to entertain them: neither are the offerings of game and fish forgotten.

"When those persons are at the height of their intoxication and quarrels, the mapono comes forth from the sanctuary and commanding silence, announces that he has laid their necessities before the gods; that he has received very favorable answers, that they have promised to the people all sorts of prosperity, rain as it might be wanted, a good harvest, abundant game and fish, everything which they can desire. One day an Indian less credulous than his fellows said, in a good-humoured way, that the gods had taken a good drink, and were put in a good temper by the chica: the mapono, who heard this ebullition of jest, immediately changed his magnificent promises, and threatened the people with tempests, thunders, famine, and death.

"Sometimes the mapono reports very cruel answers from his gods. He orders a whole village to take up arms, and casting itself upon a neighbouring people, to pillage all that can be brought away, and to destroy the rest in fire and blood. He is always obeyed. This perpetuates enmity and uninterrupted war amongst these tribes, which lead to their mutual destruction. Such is the recompense of their servitude to the infernal spirit who loves discord and strife, and whose sole aim is the eternal ruin of his adorers.

"Besides these principal gods, they adore others of an inferior order, whom they style Isituus: 'Lords of the water:' their employment is to pass through the rivers and lakes, and to stock them with fish for their devotees: the people invocate them in the fishing season, and incense them with the smoke of tobacco: if the game or the fish be abundant, they go to the temples of these deities to make the offering of a portion as a testimony of their gratitude.

"These idolaters believe that the souls are immortal (they call them oquipau,) and that at their separation from the body they are carried by their priests to heaven, where they are to have everlasting joy. When any person dies the obsequies are celebrated with more or less solemnity, according to the rank of the deceased. The mapono, to whom they believe the soul is entrusted, receives the offerings which the mother and the wife of the departed bring to him; he pours about water to purify the soul from its stains, consoles the mother and wife, and encourages their

hopes that he will speedily have good news to bring them, of the happy lot of the soul of the deceased, which he now goes to conduct to heaven.

"After some time, when he has returned from his journey, he sends for the mother and wife: and, assuming a cheerful air, he orders the wife to wipe away the tears, and to lay aside her mourning, because her husband is happy in heaven, where he waits to share his felicity with her.

"This journey of the mapono with the soul is very troublesome. He must traverse thick forests, rugged mountains, plunge into valleys filled with rivers, lakes, and soft marshes, until, after many labours and great fatigue, he arrives at a large river, over which is a wooden bridge, guarded day and night by a god named Tatusiso, who presides over the passages of souls, and puts the mapono in the way to heaven.

"This god has a pale visage, a bald head, and a countenance which inspires horror; his body is full of ulcers, and his clothing is only wretched rags. He does not go to the temple to receive the homage of his devotees: the nature of his occupation does not afford him leisure, for he is continually employed in passing souls. Sometimes this god seizes upon the soul on its journey, especially if it be that of a young man, for the purpose of purifying it. If the soul be not very docile, and offers resistance, he grows angry, and, taking it up, hurls it into the river to be drowned. This, they say, is the source of so many mishaps which take place in the world.

"Continual rains had ruined the harvest in the land of the Jururaros. The people, who were inconsolable, applied to the mapono, to inquire of the gods the cause of their great calamity. The mapono, after having taken sufficient time to consult the deities, reported their answer, which was, that in carrying to heaven the soul of a young man of their village, who refused to be purified, the soul treated Tatusiso so disrespectfully, that he was flung into the river. At this news, the young man's father, who had great affection for his child, and believed him already in heaven, was inconsolable; but, in this extremity, the mapono was at no loss. He told the parent, that if he prepared a proper canoe for him, he would go in quest of his child's soul to the very bottom of the river. The canoe was soon provided, and the mapono took it away upon his shoulders. Soon afterwards the rain ceased, and the weather became settled. He came with good tidings to the old man, but the canoe never made its appearance. Their paradise, after all, is but a poor one; and the pleasures which exist there will be only a wretched mode of satisfying the most moderate reasonable being. They say that it contains a forest of huge trees, which distil a gum, upon which the souls subsist, and that there are apes there which you would take for Ethiopians; there is honey and a small quantity of fish. You see a great eagle flying about in every direction: and the fables which they relate of him are so ridiculous and pitiable, that one cannot help deploring the blindness of these poor people."

These volumes contain extremely interesting geographical, statistical, botanical, and historical information, besides, the singular recital of the astonishing labours, the persevering exertions, the untiring zeal, and incalculable sacrifices made by the men who sowed the seeds of Christianity, and laid the foundation of civilized society on this continent.

To attempt a general review of the volumes is altogether out of the question; and though we have by no means exhausted the topics which

we selected, as likely to be interesting for their novelty, if for no other cause, still, we believe that enough has been produced to show how unfounded is the argument which some very elegant and admired European writers have attempted to build upon the allegation, that the Christian missionaries found in South America entire and extensive nations, in which there never had been any religion, and whose inhabitants not only had no form of worship, but that the existence of a God was never known to them or to their progenitors.

We have in vain sought for some evidence in these volumes, of the splendid worship of the Peruvians, which has so often dazzled our young imagination, and let us to consider the people of this El Dorado, as something far beyond what our blanketed brethren of these states now exhibit; once we turned eagerly to the account of Pisco, in whose vicinity is a mountain, which was, in former days, the great station for the adorers of the sun. Though we did not seek such ruins as those of Athens, nor calculate upon beholding what might vie with the Coliseum or the Pantheon—yet we did expect something, considerably less, it is true, than the Pyramids or the Sphinx. We had determined to be satisfied with even less than a remnant of one of the hundred gates of Thebes. We met only the following, in a letter from Father Morghen to the Marquis of Reybac, dated at Guacho, on the 20th of September, 1755:

"Two or three leagues from this (Pisco) is a mountain, where it is pretended the Indians formerly used to assemble to adore the sun. There is a tradition, that those savages used to throw from the acclivity of this mountain into the sea, pieces of gold, of silver, and of emerald, which abounded in this country, together with a quantity of other jewels which they had. This mountain is so famous in the province, that it is the first object of a stranger's curiosity upon his arrival. I followed this established custom, but found nothing worthy of a traveller's notice."

Father Morghen is but the relator of what was seen by a companion, for his letter to the Marquis is compiled from the observations of another missionary; but he had a good opportunity of forming a correct opinion, in several instances, from his own observation; and in others, as well from conversing with his brethren, as from reading their notes and narratives. Perhaps several of our readers, after the perusal of this article, will be disposed to agree with his remark to the Marquis.

"I have not forgotten the glowing pictures which you once gave me of this country, but I beg leave to assure you they by no means resemble the original, and that the travellers who have suggested those notions to us, have taken less pains to give true statements, than to delight the minds of their readers. I am far from saying that Peru is one of those sterile and wild regions which has nothing pleasing for strangers. There certainly might be found here many singularities to draw the attention of curious travellers; but there must be a serious deduction made from

the stock of notions which a European has formed. You will judge by the recital of the missionary, whose mere copyist I might call myself.''

We shall conclude the view of South America, with the following extract from the same letter:—

''In leaving the territory of Pisco, I entered upon the province of Chinca, whose capital is at present a small Indian village of the same name. Formerly it was a powerful city which contained nearly two hundred thousand inhabitants; they used to count their population by millions in this province, but to-day it is nearly a desert; there is a remnant of something over two hundred families. I found on my road some monuments which had been erected to preserve the recollection of those giants who are mentioned in Peruvian history, and who were struck by thunder for crimes similar to what formerly brought down fire from heaven upon the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Indians furnish the following tradition:— They state that during a deluge, by which their country was inundated, they retired to the tops of the hills until the waters flowed off into the sea; that when they descended to the plains, they found there men of an exraordinary stature, who waged a cruel war upon them; those who escaped from its desolation were obliged to take refuge in the caves of the mountains; where having remained for some years, they perceived in the sky a young man, who launched thunder against the giants, and upon the destruction of those usurpers, the refugees were enabled to repossess their ancient domains. One cannot learn when this deluge occurred; perhaps it was partial, like that of Deucalion and Pyrrha, in Thessaly, in the account of which, ancient authors have left us a mingling of truth and fable. · As regards the existence and the crimes of the giants, I shall give no opinion, especially as the monuments which fell under my view, have no characteristic of antiquity. The traces of the famous wars which have devastated this province, have something more of reality. Once a charming country, it is now a vast desert, which saddens you by the recollection of the unhappy lot of its ancient inhabitants; one cannot pursue his journey through it without feelings of awe; and the tranquil melancholy of the few Indians whom he meets, appears to remind him incessantly of the misfortunes and death of their ancestors. These Indians most fondly preserve the recollection of the last of their Incas. They assemble occasionally to celebrate his memory. They sing verses in his praise, and perform upon their flutes such melodiously mournful and pathetic airs, as to create sympathy in all who hear them. Persons have seen striking effects of this music. Two Indians, melted by its strains, some days since cast themselves from the summit of a craggy mountain to rejoin their prince, and render to him in another world those services which they would have gladly paid to him here. This tragic scene is frequently renewed, and thus eternizes in the Indian mind, the affecting recollection of their progenitors' calamities.''

We have thus taken a pretty extensive view of the materials which these volumes furnish respecting the religion of our aborigines. They were idolatrous polytheists, having a variety of rude, barbarous, and too often demoralizing rites in their ceremonial. They were grossly superstitious. Superstition is the relying upon any rite or observance for an effect, which it is not calculated by its own nature to produce; or which has not in the supernatural order been attached or promised to its performance by God, who can, if he will, certainly bestow the

effect on such an occasion by his own power, without using the natural cause. Neither the nature of the act, nor the revelation of the Godhead led the Indian to this expectation; he blindly observed the rites, and foolishly expected, without any rational grounds, a result for which no sufficient cause existed. And the superstition varied with the caprice of those who had the power to regulate; this power was established sometimes by force, often upon accident, not unusually by the observance of some custom that might, in its origin, have been rational, but obscured, perverted, misunderstood, and misapplied, degenerated into a sort of mysterious tradition of a forgotten date, and an unexplained import; the blind and obstinate adherence to which is, indeed, the very essence of this criminal folly.

We are of opinion that amongst various tribes, similarity of religious observances goes far to prove a common origin; and impressed as we are, with a belief in the probability of the occupation of our soil, in the first instance, by an Asiatic race, whether Persian, Hindoo or Chinese, whether the colonists were Chinese of a Hindoo descent, or were the children of the various southern and eastern portions of that continent, who, in their canoes, were borne from spot to spot, as resting-places in the Pacific, till they reached our shores; whilst the more hardy sons of Northern Asia, having penetrated through the Scandinavian woods, deluged the older Europe, we cannot well determine. But when we recollected the sun-worship of Persia, and the Gheber's fire; when we knew of the fidelity of the widow of the East, and found also among several of the Asiatic tribes, customs similar to those which we observe at this side of the globe; we were anxious to discover some authentic account of the Mexican and Peruvian worship, as those nations appeared to us to rank foremost in civilization amongst our red heathen. Our readers have seen how little we have been able to learn as regards the latter, and we have nothing of the former. In looking through the four volumes which lie before us, we have found the most copious and detailed account of the worship of the sun, and some other religious observances to be that which Father Petit furnishes us respecting the Natchez, and with which we shall conclude this article.

"Their religion, in many points, comes very near that of the ancient Romans, they have a temple filled with idols; these idols are the different figures of men and animals, to which they pay the most profound veneration. Their temple, in its form, resembles an oven of earth, about one hundred feet in circumference; it is entered by a little door four feet high, and not more than three in breadth: in it there is no window to be seen. The circular roof of the edifice is covered with three layers of mats placed one upon the other, to prevent the rains from wearing away the masonry. Above these, and outside of the building, are three figures of eagles in

wood, painted red, yellow, and white. Before the door is a kind of shed, with a double door, where the guardian of the temple is lodged; all around extends an enclosure of palisades, upon which are fixed the skulls of all the heads which their warriors have brought back from the battles which they have fought with the enemies of their nation.

"In the interior of the temple are shelves disposed at regular distances, one above the other. Upon these are placed baskets of cane of an oval figure, in which are enclosed the bones of their ancient chiefs, and by the side of them, those of the victims who are strangled to follow their masters to the other world; one other shelf, separated from the rest, supports many wide, well-painted baskets, in which their idols are preserved; these are figures of men and women made of stone and baked earth; heads and tails of uncommon serpents; stuffed owls; pieces of crystal and jaw-bones of large fish. They had there, in the year 1699, a bottle and the foot of a glass, of which they took peculiar care.

"They take great pains to keep in this temple a perpetual fire, and their attention is required to hinder it from blazing; for that purpose, they use nothing but the dry wood of the walnut tree or the oak. The old men are obliged to carry, each in his turn, a large billet into the enclosure of the palisade. The number of the guardians of the temple is fixed, and they serve by the quarter. He that is upon duty, stands, like a sentinel, under the shed, whence he examines if the fire is in danger of being extinguished; he supplies it with two or three large billets, which are kept burning only at the extremity, and which in order to avoid a blaze, are never placed one upon the other.

"Of all the women, none but the sisters of the Great Chief have the privilege of entering into the temple: to all others, admittance is prohibited, as also to the common people, even when they bring food to the manes of their relations, whose bones are reposing in the temple. These meat-offerings are given to the guardian, who carries them to the side of the basket where are the bones of the deceased: this ceremony continues only during one moon. The eatables are then cast over the palisades of the enclosure, and are abandoned to wild beasts.

"The sun is the principal object of worship among these people. As they conceive nothing superior to this luminary, nothing, therefore, appears to them more worthy of their homage; and for the same reason, their Grand Chief, who knows nothing upon earth superior to himself, takes the title of Brother of the Sun. The credulity of the people preserves for him the despotic authority which he assumes. To maintain for him a stricter obedience, a mound is raised with earth brought for the purpose, whereon is built his hut, which is of the same construction as the temple, with its door towards the rising sun. Every morning the Great Chief honours with his presence the rising of his elder brother, and hails with many howlings his appearance above the horizon. Next he orders his calumet to be lighted, and makes him an offering of the first three mouthfuls of smoke which he inhales; then elevating his hands above his head, and turning himself from the east to the west, he points out to him the course which he must pursue in his journey.

"When the Grand Chief dies, his hut is demolished, and a new mound is raised, whereon is built the hut of the successor to his dignity, who never dwells in the lodging of his predecessor. There are old men who teach the laws to the rest of the people; one of the principal of these is to have a sovereign respect for the Grand Chief, as being brother of the sun and master of the temple. They believe in the immortality of the soul. When they leave this world, they go, say they, to inhabit

another, there to be rewarded or punished. The rewards which they promise themselves, consist principally in good cheer, and the punishment in a privation of all pleasure. Thus they believe that those who have been faithful observers of their laws, will be conducted to a region of delight, where all sorts of the most exquisite viands will be furnished them in abundance; that their days will glide away pleasantly and calmly in the midst of festivities, of dances and women; in fine, that they will taste of all imaginable pleasures: that, on the contrary, the violators of their laws will be cast upon lands sterile, and covered with water; that they will have no kind of grain; that they will be exposed entirely naked to the piercing bites of mosquitoes; that all nations will make war against them; that they will never eat meat; and that they will be fed with nothing but the flesh of alligators, of bad fish, and shell-fish. * *

"One of the principal articles of their religion, especially as concerns the domestics of the Grand Chief, is to honour his funeral ceremonies by dying with him, for the purpose of serving him in the other world; these blinded creatures submit themselves willingly to this law, in the foolish persuasion, that, in the suite of their chief, they are going to enjoy very great happiness.

"To form some idea of this bloody ceremony, it must be known that whenever a presumptive heir to the Grand Chief is born, each family that has a child at the breast must do homage to him on its account. From all these infants a certain number is chosen, who are destined to his service, and when they arrive at a competent age, are given some employment conformable to their talents; some pass their lives either in hunting or fishing, for the supply of his table; others are engaged in agriculture; others are employed for no other purpose but to swell his train. If he chances to die, all his domestics sacrifice themselves with pleasure to follow their dear master. They immediately put on their most splendid attire, and go to the place of execution, which is opposite the temple, where all the people are assembled. After having sung and danced for a time sufficiently long, they pass around their neck a cord of ox-hide, with a slip-knot, and immediately the ministers appointed for this kind of execution set about strangling them, at the same time charging them to go and rejoin their master, and to resume in the other world stations still more honourable than those which they have filled in this. The principal domestics having been strangled after this manner, their bones, especially those of the arms and the thighs, are cleaned of the flesh; they are left to dry up for two months in a kind of tomb, after which they are taken out to be inclosed in baskets, and placed in the temple by the side of those of their master. As to the other domestics, their kindred carry them to their huts, and bury them with their arms and their attire. This same ceremony is observed in like manner at the death of the brothers and sisters of the Great Chief. The women are always strangled, to follow their mistresses, except those who have infants at the breast,—for, in that case, they continue to live in order to suckle them. Many, however, seek nurses for their children, or they themselves strangle their infants, that they may not lose the right of sacrificing themselves in the public place, according to the ordinary ceremonies, and as the law ordains.

. . . . . .

"Formerly the nation of the Natchez was very considerable—it counted sixty villages, and eight hundred suns or princes; now it is reduced to six small villages, and eleven suns. In each of these villages there is a temple, where the fire is always kept up, as in that of the Great Chief, to whom all the other chiefs are subordinate. It is the Great Chief who appoints to all the most considerable offices of the state,

such as the two commanders in war, the two masters of ceremony in the worship of the temple, and so forth.

"Every year the people assemble to sow a great field of Indian corn, of beans, of gourds, and of melons. They assemble in the same manner to gather in the harvest. A great hut, situated in a beautiful prairie, is intended to preserve the fruits of this harvest. Every summer, towards the end of July, the people collect together by order of the Great Chief, to partake of a grand feast which is given. This festival lasts three days and three nights. Every one contributes whatever he can furnish,—some bring game, others fish, and so forth. There are dances almost continually. The Great Chief and his sister are lodged in a hut elevated and covered with foliage, whence they observe the amusements of their subjects. The princes, the princesses, and those who, by their offices, hold a distinguished rank, keep very near the Chief, to whom they show their respect and their submission by an infinity of ceremonies.

"The Great Chief and his sister make their entry to the place of assemblage upon a sedan carried by eight of the largest men. The Chief holds in his hand a large sceptre, adorned with painted feathers; all the people dance and sing round about him, in token of the public joy. On the last day of this festival, he collects all his subjects, and makes them a long harangue, in which he exhorts them to fulfil all the duties of religion; he advises them, above all things, to have a great veneration for the spirits who dwell in the temple, and to instruct their children well. If any one has signalized himself by any action of zeal, he publicly eulogizes him. This happened in the year 1702. The lightning having struck the temple, and reduced it to ashes, seven or eight women cast their infants into the midst of the flames to appease the wrath of heaven. The Great Chief summoned out these women, and bestowed upon them great praise for the resolution with which they had sacrificed that which was most dear to them,—and finished his panegyric by exhorting the other females to imitate so noble an example in a similar conjuncture.

"The fathers of families never fail to carry to the temple the earliest productions of their fruit, their grain, and their vegetables—they are, indeed, presents made to the nation; they are immediately offered at the door of the temple, where the guardian, after having displayed them and presented them to the spirits, carries them to the Great Chief, who makes such a distribution of them as he thinks proper, without exciting the least sign of discontent.

"They never sow any land of which the grain has not been presented to the temple with the usual ceremonies. Whenever these people approach the temple, they lift up their arms, through respect, and give three howls. After which they strike their hands upon the earth, and rise up three times with as many reiterated howls. When they only pass before the temple, they stop simply to salute it, with their eyes cast down, and their arms elevated. If a father or a mother perceives that their child omits this ceremony, he will be immediately punished by some strokes of the baton."

We trust that exertions will be made to collect the facts respecting a race of men who must be viewed by every American with deep interest. The nature of the publication which we have thus partially reviewed, has greatly confined the view which we should like to see taken by our literary associations. It is too much the fashion to be satisfied with noticing what falls under our own observations; and, speculating upon

possible causes, we waste that time which might be employed in the investigation of what has actually occurred.

In conclusion, we throw out the question amongst our antiquarians, whether the mounds upon which the Natchez built their temples, might not account for those hillocks, of which so many are found, and concerning which so little is known?

DESCENT OF ÆNEAS TO THE SHADES

THE ADVANTAGES OF GUIDING THE IMAGINATION BY TOPOGRAPHY IN WORKS OF FICTION, ILLUSTRATED BY AN EXAMINATION OF THE SIXTH BOOK OF VIRGIL'S ÆNEID

[A Communication to the *Southern Literary Journal*, Vol. I. No. 1.]

In reading the works of poets or others, which are generally styled fiction, perhaps we have been too apt to regard the productions of the best writers [as] more imaginative than in truth they are. When Horace tells those who would write, either to follow nature, or to invent what would have all its parts in keeping; they who desire to observe the rule, will perhaps find it much easier and better calculated to insure success, to take the first part of the admonition than the second; and probably the great cause why a vast multitude of authors of this description have had so little success, will be found in the fact, that the greater number, in creating their scenery, have consulted their imagination in preference to their observation.

This idea has impressed itself more deeply upon my mind, since I have been led to believe, that the most beautiful and finished pictures of one of the masters of poetry were sketches from nature, embellished indeed by imagination, and improved with exquisite taste, and not merely the results of fiction.

Something more than two years have elapsed, since, on a beautiful evening in May, I drove out, accompanied by a few friends, on the road leading from Naples towards the ancient Puteoli; when we arrived near the entrance of the grotto of Posilippo, a proposition was made to alight and climb the steep zigzag road, leading to the tomb of Virgil. Arrived at the door of the garden in which this mouldering relic is situated, we quickened our pace as we doubled the windings of the narrow path that, by a long circuit, leads to this spot of classic interest. We stood silent within this decaying chamber—we looked around on its desolate walls and time-worn, vaulted roof, all stained with the green tinge of successive centuries. A marble slab of comparatively modern sculpture, perhaps placed about two or three hundred years since in one of the sides, unnecessarily proclaimed, in a crabbed imitation of Latin, that of

which every peasant child was aware, that this chamber was the resting-place of the great Mantuan bard; here what was mortal of the polished Maro, had mouldered.

We viewed each other. We looked from the aperture in the side —the bay of Naples spread broadly before us. It was a serene sky—a light air moved along the waters—a thin, brown vapour above its summit distinguished Vesuvius in the distance. We looked down to the road where we had left our carriage; we involuntarily drew back from the precipice, and again advanced to see how diminished to the view were the beings entering or issuing from the excavated tunnel, as they travelled at such a distance below us, from or towards Naples. The tongue ventured to express a few words, and we soon resumed our conversation. We agreed that the spot upon which the body of the poet was deposited after death, was one well calculated during life to have excited his enthusiasm, enriched his imagination, and stored his memory with the materials for description.

A few mornings afterwards, we were seated upon the indurated lava at the summit of Vesurius; it was about an hour after the sun had risen: even then his rays were powerful. We were fatigued and heated by the immense labour of climbing the mighty precipice of ashes; vast masses of cinder glowed under us, hundreds of fissures emitted hot sulphuric vapour scarcely perceptible to the eye, but fully sensible to the smell and feeling. Our guides drew from the brown ashes the eggs which they had brought up for the repast; a very few minutes had sufficed for the cooking—they found the finest salt on almost every fragment within their reach. And yet in this region of fire, the gentle temperature of the breeze gradually refreshed and invigorated us. Our faces were turned towards the tomb at the opposite side of the bay. The city, considerably below us, showed on our right like a rich, white margin between the land and water; in a few places this appeared thicker, and advanced a little upon the expanded plain that stretched along towards the Adriatic. The road to Herculaneum, the little town of Torre del Greco, and a number of others, were discernible, and we looked on our left, to try and ascertain the site of Pompeii, through whose desolate streets we had walked but two days previously. The island of Capri rose as a dark mass in what was anciently called the Tyrrhenian Sea, but the eye discerned the horizon of water glittering far beyond it, and we could observe the liquid element spreading to the west and south of Procida and Ischya, to the west from the ridge of Posillippo; the reflection from the waters near Baiæ, seemed like that of liquid silver, and

the eye reached towards the north even to Gaeta. One of my companions on discovering the headland repeated,

Tu quoque litoribus nostri, Æneia nutrix
Æternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti
Et nunc servat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen
Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria signat.

"And thou, O matron of immortal fame
Here dying, to the shore hast left thy name.
Caieta still the place is called from thee,
The nurse of great Æneas' infancy.
Here rest thy bones in rich Hesperia's plains,
Thy name ('tis all a ghost can claim) remains."

"This was the spot selected by Virgil for perhaps the best and most beautiful of his descriptions," said he, "and surely he could not have chosen a better." We had previously visited the splendid Museum of Naples, in whose numerous and extensive departments so many remains of the genius of southern Italy are collected. We spoke of several that have been lately dug up, after an interment of nearly twenty centuries under the masses of sand and ashes, flung over many a league from that very crater upon whose edge we were then seated. We admired the ingenuity, the patience, the industry, the zeal and information of those scientific men whom we had seen unrolling, deciphering, copying, supplying the chasms, and preparing for publication the ancient volume of parchment, reduced nearly to a mass of carbon in the ruins which fiery lava had created. And turning to one of my friends, who was an inhabitant of Great Britain, I remarked, "These are the men whom your writers have represented as ignorant, lazy, priest-ridden Italians, enemies to science and degraded in superstition! ! !" "I acknowledge," said he, "that our writers have, for party purposes, done the Italians the greatest injustice, and at your side of the Atlantic, you are not only our rivals, but as you claim pre-eminence in so many departments, you will not, I am convinced, deny that many of your writers have outstripped us even in this." I could not make all the concessions he desired. We agreed therefore, to leave the pretensions of the United Kingdom, and those of the United States, to be settled by the King of Holland, or by any other arbiter that may be agreed on by better authorized plenipotentiaries, and we returned to the discussion of descriptions given by Virgil. Yet this was connected with the visits we had paid to the Museum, because it was there we had first heard of the work of the Rev. Andrew Jorio, a learned canon of Naples, who is as eminent for his literature as he is for his unpretending piety; it was there we had first learned his opinion, that the passages contained in the sixth book

of the Æneid, describing the infernal regions of Tartarus and of Elysium, were all suggested to the poet from a spot near Baiæ. We had there procured the treatise, and were led to discuss its merits, whilst we projected a hasty visit to the same regions, to pass freely through which even at this day, requires the offering of a sprig from the golden branch. I regretted that an indisposition under which he laboured whilst I was in the south of Italy, prevented my having the gratification of making the acquaintance of this respectable and accomplished scholar, whom I desired much to know, not only on account of his scientific and literary attainments, but also for his ministerial usefulness. My own time was also curtailed, and I was not able to make all the excursions that I had intended in this most interesting neighbourhood. I have, however, attentively perused the work of Canon Jorio, and seen something of the vicinity. Perhaps I could, therefore, with some little prospect of success, undertake to show you by his description, some of the reasons for the assertion with which I have set out; that the writers who, in works of fiction, found their descriptions upon observation in preference to mere imagination, are those most likely to succeed.

Two facts are incontestable. First, in the fifth book the poet describes the departure of the remnant of the Trojan fleet from Sicily, for the purpose of making a descent upon Italy, and especially, that it was the intention of Æneas to visit the shade of his father in Elysium according to the admonition of Anchises himself, who in line 735 informs him who shall be his guide:

Huc casta Sybilla
Nigrantum multo pecudum te sanguine ducet.

"The chaste Sybilla shall your steps convey,
And blood of offered victims strew the way."

It is also certain that his voyage lay nearly west of north from Gaeta to the mouth of the Tiber, and leaving the shore of Cumæ, the closing lines of the sixth book informs us that his way for Gaeta lay directly along shore, of course in nearly a northern direction. These premises lead us, independently of any other consideration, to the discovery of the spot upon which he landed in search of the Sibyl. It was the coast of Cumæ, upon the western side of the promontory which, at the north entrance to the Bay of Naples, puts down about three miles to the south, thus forming the tongue of land which divides the Bay of Puzzoli from the Mediterranean Sea. A difficulty seemed to present itself to a few critics, as some said it was not Cumæ, but Baiæ, and this would not lead us to the spot which it is contended, furnished the poet with his topography. Cumæ was a settlement of the Eubeans, and only

one of the many Grecian colonies that filled the south of Italy, which, as every person at all acquainted with ancient geography knows, was called Grecia Magna. That there was an extension of this colony to Baiæ, which is quite in its vicinity, is pretty certain; hence Dion Cassius and others, called the bay of this latter also by the name of the former. In 1822, an ancient Greek sepulchre similar to those of the settlement at Cumæ, was discovered at Baiæ, which sustains the statement of Strabo respecting the extent of the colony. The headland, which we are about to examine, runs down little more than three miles at the utmost, and is scarcely two miles across. The spot where the poet makes Æneas land, is somewhat less than two miles north from the southwestern point of the promontory, over which rises the hill now called Monte di Procida, and which the canon says is that described in line 234:

Monte sub aerio qui nunc Misenus ab illo
Dicitur.

"And deathless fame
Still to the lofty cape consigns his name:"

and which derives its name from the burial of Hector's trumpeter. The shore here is free from rocks or cliffs, and is a fine strand. Hence the description of the arrival of the strangers after the loss of Palinurus, is exceedingly appropriate:

Sic fatur lacrymans classique immittit habenas
Et tandem Euboicis Cumaeum allabitur oris!

"He said and wept; then spread his sails before
The winds, and reached at length the Cuman shore."

Turning to the left from the supposed place of landing, the site of the ancient temple of Apollo is found, at the distance of three quarters of a mile. Here some remains of a structure are still discovered. Still the spot is called Procea di Cuma, and the peasants call the hill which rises here Monte di Cuma. The poet has certainly embellished the temple erected in a remote antiquity, with sculpture worthy of a better age. Yet it is astonishing to find from unequivocal proof, furnished by undoubted works of these early times, the progress which had been even then made in the arts in those regions. I have seen frescoes which have been nearly three thousands years executed, and which have been overwhelmed with rubbish during the greater portion of that time, as clear, as vivid, and as accurate in the outlines of the figures as many which would be admired as good productions at this day. That this temple was erected long before the arrival of Æneas in Italy, there is great reason to believe.

I shall not here inquire concerning the Sibyl, but we may perhaps, examine her supposed habitation:

Excisum Euboicae latus ingens rupis in antrum
Qua lati ducunt aditus centum, ostia centum
Unde ruunt totidem voces, responsa Sybillae.

"A spacious cave within the farthest part
Was hewed and fashioned by laborious art
Through the hill's hollow sides; before the place
A hundred doors a hundred entries grace:
As many voices issue: and the sound
Of Sibyl's words as many times rebound."

The present appearance of this cavern, certainly does not correspond with the description here given, nor would the description have been at any period perfectly accurate: much must have been left to the imagination of the poet; all that the canon contends for, ought, I think, to be willingly conceded, which is that the poet led his hero by this route to the nether world. To any person who has seen the Capitol of Rome, the Tarpeian Rock, the Forum of Trajan, the Arch of Septimius Severus, or any of the excavations by which the Via Sacra has been disclosed, little need be said to show how the accumulation of centuries will fill up hollows and reduce the elevations of precipices.

This spot is only a few miles from the tomb of Virgil, and the poet must have frequently strayed along this shore. Nearly two thousand years have passed away since he observed the place, and then it was at least a thousand years after the excavation had been made; and he who had been accustomed to examine such works, and who generally was exact in his descriptions, could at that time form a better idea of what this excavation was; the canon thinks he only gives us the round number one hundred for several, and conformed to the ordinary notion that the cave was the residence of some supernatural or inspired being, and thus easily made it the dwelling of the Sibyl.

The substance of an interesting archæological dissertation which he gives, is that this, like many other caverns generally thought to be natural, is in truth artificial. Such clearly was Virgil's opinion: "Excisum latus ingens in antrum." That the cave was cut into the side of the rock. To sustain this position, the canon brings us to contemplate the customs of the first Grecian settlers, which indeed were similar to those of others similarly circumstanced. Scarcely landed, the first two objects they sought were a dwelling-place and security. No spot on the Cumæan coast offered a more convenient location for the purpose than this—the only rock which is near that part of the shore. Their usual mode was to build with stone, for this the rock afforded material; its elevation was convenient for security, and this would be greatly increased by so clearing away the projections of the cliff as to make it

perpendicular, at least on two or three sides. By the process of paring it off in this manner, they were also furnished with stone for building. They were a patient and persevering race, and though emigrants, they had not the insatiable, migratory spirit of many of our pioneers. Leaving one habitation, they determined to fix upon another as permanent.

Hence they made preparations for centuries of residences, as they built for a progeny through whose generations they considered themselves about to live.

After having given to the rock its faces, they proceedeed from the summit to perforate to its bosom, and having descended to a sufficient depth they excavated several large chambers for the double purpose of procuring materials, and of creating a citadel and a store-house. Here, too, they penetrated to the living waters, so that no enemy should be able to cut off a supply. From the interior they wrought long passages towards the sides, and at the extremities they made loopholes, through which they might receive air and some light, and be able also to reconnoitre and to annoy an enemy.

It is acknowledged by all respectable antiquarians that such was the origin of numerous excavations in rocks spread through the south of Italy, and of many elsewhere. Martorelli, upon the authority of Strabo and Ephorus, sustains that several of these were excavations in search of ore. In most of these citadels there was a temple, and generally the shrine of some prophet or prophetess was in the most retired part of the cavern.

In the time of Virgil several of these loopholes were considerably enlarged, and the earth had been gradually raised around the rock, so that the former windows now became so many entrances to the interior, which had probably been once famous as the shrine of some pythoness or perhaps of the great Sibyl herself; at this day some of those apertures exist, though the rock is nearly level with the surrounding accumulation of earth. We have the accounts of St. Justin the martyr, and of Agatius the historian, describing this cave.

In 1787, Carletti says he got nearly lost in its labyrinths; but that he saw the remains of the temple and pieces of mosaic work at a spot where several passages united. Jorio himself, in 1811, went through a considerable portion of it, accompanied by a guide; he remained two hours, and found some human remains, which so terrified his companions that they could not be induced by threats or promises to go forward.

So far, then, we have the description accurate in its principle features, but highly embellished by imagination.

At the entrance of this cavern, the hero of the poem is admonished

to seek for the information that he desired, and having obtained as much as the poet thought convenient to communicate, he requests to be taught the way to the infernal regions.

The lake known as the Lago di Averno is little more than half a mile east of this cavern, but at the time Virgil wrote, the country was more thickly wooded than it is at present, and it was still more so at that earlier period which the poet has selected, nor was the lake to be approached in a direct line; hence the canon supposes that the path to the spot which he indicates as *fauces Averni*, must have wound along the valley which lies between the rock we have been describing, and the high and rugged ground which surrounds the lake. The Trojan leader, in pursuing this course, would have increased the distance round the northern part of the lake, to arrive at its opposite side, nearly three miles, and this journey was to be made through a forest.

Tenent media omnia sylvae.

"Betwixt those regions and our upper light,
Deep forests and impenetrable night
Possess the middle space."

In studying the topography, we have no concern with either the death or burial of Misenus, nor with the manner in which Æneas obtains the golden bough which was to insure his return to the realms of day; neither need we witness the sacrifice.

Little more than a quarter of a mile to the southeast of the Lago di Averno is the Lago Lucrino, or ancient Lucrine Lake, so famous for producing some of the luxuries for Roman Tables, as also for the naval purposes to which it was destined by Octavianus, and generally for its being more appropriate to recreation than to the fears of those who dwelt or sojourned at Baiæ. A deep valley passed from the Lake Avernus towards the Lucrine. And in this valley the canon supposses that the doves led the hero to pluck the golden bough.

Inde ubi venere ad fauces graveolentis Averni,
Tollunt se celeres, liquidumque per aera lapsae,
Sedibus optatis gemina sub arbore sedunt
Discolor unde auri per ramos aura refulsit.

"Thus they led him on
To the slow lake: whose baneful stench to shun
They winged their flight aloft; stopping low,
Perched on the double tree that bears the golden bough;
Through the green leaves the glittering shadows glow."

The branch having been delivered to Sibyl, and the last rites paid to the body of Misenus, we find Æneas and the prophetess already still farther south than the spot to which the doves had led him to obtain his passport. A large cavern here extends from Avernus nearly to the Luc-

rine Lake; at present it is seldom passable in summer, but it is opened occasionally in winter, and the entrance at the north was formerly quite overshadowed by woods. This has been appropriately selected by the poet as the entrance to the infernal regions.

Spelunca alta fuit, vastoque immanis hiatu,
Scrupea, tuta lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris,
Quam super haud ultae poterant impune volantes
Tendere iter pennis; talis sese halitus atris
Faucibus effundens supera ad convexa ferebat:
Unde locum Graii, dixerunt nomine Avernum.

"Deep was the cave and downwards as it went
From the wide mouth, a rocky, rough descent;
And here, the access, a gloomy grove descends,
And here the unnavigable lake extends,
O'er whose unhappy waters, void of light,
No bird presumes to steer his airy flight:
Such deadly stenches from the depth arise,
And steaming sulphur, that infects the skies,
From hence the Grecian bards, their legends make,
And give the name Avernus to the lake."

I presume the etymology is sufficiently known to be the privative particle α and the word ορνος a bird: originally αορνος and euphonized to Avernus.

The sacrifice having been offered, the awful portents being manifest, Æneas is warned to draw his sword and to advance into the cavern, whither his guides had already rushed. This the poet calls "primæ fauces Orci," the first jaws of Orcus. The poetical description of the beings who occupied this cavern is one of the best-imagined and best-wrought productions of Virgil; but this is not the place to dilate upon its appropriate excellence.

Issuing from the southern aperture between you and the Lucrine Lake, even at this day, elms are abundant, but formerly they were larger, more numerous, and thickly entangled. The path is in a narrow ravine. On either hand were caverns, many of which were the dens of wild animals and the abode of serpents. In several places the earth has fallen in, and the caves are choked, but still some are visible on either hand; and the canon thinks it very likely, that about the period when Virgil wrote, this might have served as a menagerie for the parties who rusticated near the ancient Puteoli or at Baiæ. In either case, the poet had the groundwork upon which his imagination could well indulge itself. The cavern is at present called Bagno della Sibilla, and the *stabula feranum in feribus* exhibit to us the dwelling-places of the hideous forms that besiege the door, and have their dens in its vicinity, and the

elm with its dusky arms has to this day remained, and made manifest the principle to which I have alluded.

Before proceeding further with this Trojan chief, it will be, perhaps, not amiss to examine briefly an assertion of our learned commentator, that the Styx is not specially described by the poet, but that where the expression does occur in this sixth book, it is but a general designation, not a particular appellation of an infernal river. We have, it is true, five lakes within the compass of this peninsula, and there were five rivers of the shadowy regions. Avernus is too plainly marked to allow a doubt of its identity: the Fusaro and the Acquimarta will be easily recognized as the Acheron and the Cocytus: the context and other circumstances will lead us to the Maremorto as Lethe, and the Lucrine Lake alone would remain as the Styx. This river was said to be the daughter of Oceanus: every classic reader is aware that in the days of Homer, and even in those of Virgil, the Bay of Pozzuoli and the contiguous waters were known as the ocean, and when it was agitated by storms, the sea which rolled into this bay broke more easily over the low grounds, and rushed more forcibly through the communication with the Lucrine Lake: so that, in fact, it was in calm times comparatively dry, until the rushing of the ocean filled, enlarged, and made it permanent. But Jorio says that Virgil had too much taste to say to the ladies and epicures of Rome, that this was the infernal Styx—hence, that through the entire of this book, the word is to be taken in its general, and not in its particular acceptation, and a review of the several passages will show us nothing incompatible with this opinion. It is mentioned seven times, besides the particular passage which seems to me to create the greatest difficulty. First the prophetess says to Æneas—

Quod si tantus amor mentis si tanta Cupido est
Bis stygios innare lacus, bis nigra videre
Tartara.

"But if so dire a love your soul invades
As twice below to see the trembling shades.
If you so hard a toil will undertake
As twice to pass the unnavigable lake."

Second, 154.

Sic demum lucos Stygios, regna invia vivus Aspices.

"This done, securely take the destined way
To find the regions destitute of day."

Third, 252.

Tum Stygio regi nocturnas inchoat aras.

"With holocausts he Pluto's altar fills."

Fourth, 368.

Neque enim credo sine numine Divum
Flumina tanta paras Stygiamque innare paludem:
"Without whose aid you durst not undertake
This frightful passage o'er the Stygian lake."

Fifth, 388.

Navita quos jam inde ut Stygia prospexit ab unda
Per tacitum nemus ire, pedemque advertere ripae.
"Now nearer to the Stygian lake they draw,
Whom from the shore the surly boatman saw—
Observed their passage through the shady wood,
And marked their near approaches to the flood."

Sixth, 391.

Corpora viva nefas Stygia vectare carina.
"Know this the realm of night, the Stygian shore,
My boat conveys no living body o'er."

Seventh, 438.

Fata obstant, tristique palus inamabilis unda
Alligat et novies Styx interfusa coercet.
"But fate forbids; the Stygian floods oppose,
And with nine circling streams the captive soul enclose."

Of those passages, the second, third, and fourth, clearly have the expression general. The great difficulty would be to reconcile the 323d line and the general statement of the ancients respecting the oath of the gods, with the opinion of Canon Jorio, before we could say that in the first, fifth, sixth, and seventh passages, the expression was also general.

The expression of the Sibyl appears to me not only exceedingly distinct, but points to a special circumstance respecting the Styx, than which there is not in all mythology one better and more precisely understood. Line 321:

Olli sic breviter fata est longaeva sacerdos.
Anchisa generate Deum certissima proles
Cocyti stagna alta vides, Stygiamque paludem
Dii cujus jurare timent et fallere numen.
" 'Son of Anchises, offspring of the gods,'
The Sibyl said, 'you see the Stygian floods,
The sacred streams which heaven's imperial state
Attest in oaths, and fear to violate.' "

If, however, we will suppose that Virgil, like most other poets, used freely the privileges to which he was entitled, we may then take the Lucrine Lake for the Styx, and the traveller passing the *ferarum stabula*, after emerging from the grotto of Avernus leaving this on his left, proceeds by what is known as the Scalandrone, towards Lago del Fusaro—called by Virgil the Palus Acherusia or "Acherontis ad undas."

Æneas and the Sibyl having now passed through the dark grotto which lies between the Lago d'Averno and the vicinity of the Lucrine Lake, had issued from the cave into that region which we may now consider as the "Infernal."

From the southern aperture of this cavern there are three roads—one on the left hand leads in a northeast direction to Pozzuoli and Solfatara; with this we have no concern: another, southward of east, leads to the Lago Lucrino and the Gulf of Pozzuoli, the ocean of the ancients; whilst another, nearly south, leads to the Lake of Fusaro and Aquamorta, which are not a furlong apart, and not more than a mile from the cavern of Avernus, called still Bagno della Sibilla. This is, then, the only road which leads to a spot whence a view might be had of the two lakes, and is, therefore, well described in line 295.

Huic via Tartarei quae fert Acherontis ad undas
Turbidus hic caeno vastaque voragine gurges
Æstuat, atque omnem Cocyto eructat arenam.

"Hence to deep Acheron they take their way,
Whose turbid eddies, thick with ooze and clay,
Are whirled aloft and in Cocytus lost."

The relative position of the two lakes, neither of which is large, but that of the Aquamorta much the smaller, produce even to-day the same effects that are described. When by the overflowing of the sea, or any other cause, the Lago del Fusaro is overcharged, it pours a flood of turbid water, thick with filth and sands, into the Aquamorta or Cocytus, which is one of the most pestilential little mud-holes of this vicinity.

The present road from the Lucrine Lake to that of Fusaro, leads towards the northern extremity of the latter, and gives no opportunity of seeing both the supposed Acheron and Cocytus from one point. Jorio, however, gives sufficient reasons to show that the ancient road, which existed in the time of Virgil, had a different direction, and led to a small elevation, less than a furlong distant from the southeastern border of the Acheron, whence they are both fully visible, and where Sibyl might very properly have said.

Line 323:

Cocyti stagna alta vides, Stygiamque paludem;

and, indeed, the Lake of Fusaro may this day, as well as nineteen centuries ago, be properly called *palus*, as the Aquamorta is most aptly designated by the expression *stagna*.

Upon the borders of the Lake of Fusaro, the poet placed those whom he described as

Haec omnis, quam cernis inops, inhumataque turba est.
"The ghosts rejected are the unhappy crew,
Deprived of sepulchres and funerals due."

The crowd here is very great, and amongst them is the lost Palinurus, who most pathetically implores to be relieved, by having his obsequies performed, and receives the assurance from his former chieftain, that a day will come, when the rites shall be paid, and his name honourably transmitted to future ages.

At the present day you will easily find a boatman, who, occupying a bark at the spot which our Canon believes to be the same which Virgil assigned to Charon, will convey the traveller across; though this ferryman must receive a larger fee than the tariff which Pluto fixed as a sufficient remuneration for the grisly boatman of former centuries. However, all this is, perhaps, just, because the modern tourist will be treated with more civility, and is certainly more weighty than a ghost.

Having crossed the lake, at a place where it is something less than a half-mile in width, you land at less than that distance from the sea, and upon soil which this day answers the description given by the poet, in line 415.

Tandem trans fluvium incolumes vatemque virumque
Informi limo glaucaque exponit in ulva.
"His passengers at length are wafted o'er,
Exposed in muddy weeds upon the miry shore."

Turning to the north from this spot, the lake is on the left hand, and the sea within a little more than a furlong on your right, and the high headland of Monte di Procida rises with abrupt rocks before you. But not more than one hundred yards in front of you, is the little hill of Torre della Gaveta, quite near the shore and the mouth of the stream which communicates between the Lago del Fusaro and the sea. Here, in a hill, is a cavern, cut by the early Greek settlers, to form this communication between the lake and the Mediterranean. It has frequently, however, its channel so choked with sand that it becomes necessary, in the end of the spring, to clear and deepen the passage. In this also, winds and waters frequently make a fitful noise, and this was the fancied abode of Cerberus.

Line 417:

Cerberus haec ingens latratu regna trifauci
Personat adverso recubans immanus in antro.
"No sooner landed, in his den they found
The triple porter of the Stygian sound,
Grim Cerberus."

Having given to him his sop, and finding him now spread powerless in sleep:

Line 424:

Occupat Æneas aditum, custode sepulto,
Evaditque celer ripam irremeabilis undae.

"The keeper charmed, the chief, without delay,
Passed on and took the irremeable way."

The stream here may, without any great stretch of imagination, be called "not to be repassed;" for it is not by this path our hero returns.

Going forward, the traveller now ascends the hill upon which the tower of Gaveta is built, and as he descends towards the southeast, he enters a valley, which the poet describes in the succeeding lines.

Line 426:

Continuo auditae voces, vagitus et ingens,
Infantumque animae flentes in limine primo;
Quos dulcis vitae exsortes, et ab ubere raptos
Abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo;
Hos juxta falsa damnati crimine mortis.

"Before the gates the cries of babes new-born,
Whom fate had from their tender mothers torn,
Assault his ears; then those whom form of laws
Condemned to die when traitors judged their cause."

It would be curious and instructive here, to enter upon the examination of the doctrines of the ancient schools, especially that of Plato, concerning the future state; particularly as Virgil, throughout his book, gives a beautiful exemplification of the opinions of that celebrated philosopher. Having ascertained what those doctrines were, the next step would be to trace their origin; to see the sources whence he derived his information: to find how much of his knowledge he drew from the sacred volumes of the chosen people of God, and from the original traditions given by the patriarchs, of the information directly received, concerning the other world, from God himself, by Adam, by Seth, by Enos, by Noe, by Abraham, and others; to view the additions and the changes which mythology had introduced, and to see what beautiful imagery the mind of the poet spread through the description; but this is not our present object. The valley here, is just such as you would consider calculated to fill the helpless babes with terror, and to minister to the pensive feelings of the innocent victim of mistaken justice.

Jorio informs us, to sustain the accuracy of his remarks, that if you inquire of the peasants who inhabit Monte di Procida, and particularly that part called Capo Vecchie, marked by the ruins of Roman buildings, where is the road *de l'inferno*, they will bring you to the winding road, to the descent on the side of this outlet of Fusaro, by the winding paths going down from crag to crag—they will lead you to the entrance of

this valley, and thence through it, by the very way which I am about to describe.

He places, after describing the tribunal of Minos, the unfortunate suicides in the next location on the southern side of the Aqua Morta, or Cocytus. We have then the description.

440.

Nec procul huic partem fusi monstrantur in omnem
Lugentes campi: sic illos nomine dicunt.
Hic, quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit,
Secreti celant colles, et myrtea circum
Sylva tegit: curae non ipsa in morte relinquunt.

"Not far from thence the mournful fields appear,
So called from lovers that inhabit there;
The souls whom that unhappy flame invades,
In secret solitude and myrtle shades
Make endless moans, and pining with desire
Lament, too late, the unextinguished fire."

After describing a number of the unhappy victims who dwell in this dismal region, Æneas is brought to meet the wretched Dido, who treats him with fixed dislike, and deserved scorn. These plains stretch forward better than a furlong, a little south of east from the Aqua Morta, and the Canon brings to our view the mythological statement that the waters of the Cocytus were increased by the tears of unfortunate lovers, which adds to the evidence of the poet's precision, and to the probability of the Canon's opinion.

In the last stage of this religion, he places the warriors, and takes occasion to describe several of those famed for prowess in the Trojan war, and to introduce the beautiful but concise history of Deiphobus, with its instructive moral.

We now come to a spot which the poet thus describes.

Line 540

Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambos,
Dextera, quae Ditis magni sub moenia tendit;
Hac iter Elysium nobis; at laeva malorum
Exercet paenos et ad impia Tartara mittit.

" 'Tis here in different parts the way divides,
The right to Pluto's golden palace guides,
The left to that unhappy region tends,
Which to the depth of Tartarus descends,
The seat of night's profound and punished fiends."

This spot is little more than half a mile from the Aqua Morta, and at present the road divides: on your left, advancing in the way which leads from the supposed cave of Cerberus. When you come to this division, you see a region which is fitted to suggest the idea given of

Tartarus by the poet; and keeping the line to your right, you would arrive at those regions that he calls Elysium. To the left is a region bounded on the west by the Archerusian Lake and the muddy and pestilential Cocytus, while the sterile region leading to the den of beasts stretches on before you. Several critics have ridiculed the notion that there could have been in this vile and deserted spot anything to suggest to Virgil the existence of the city of the damned, such as he describes it in this sixth book. But suppose there was nothing which bore an actual resemblance to the place described, still it is properly urged that at least this much latitude should be fairly allowed to the bard, that he might place an imaginary city on the spot. Yet we will not content ourselves with this answer. It can be easily shown that in this region are to be found many of the materials from which such a city could be constructed, and that there was in former days a city upon the very site. Let us, however, look at the description.

Line 548:

Respicit Ænеas subito: et sub rupe sinistra
Maenia lata videt, triplici circumdata muro;
Quae rapidus flammis ambit torrentibus amnis,
Tartareus Phlegethon torquetque sonantia saxa.

"The hero, looking to the left, espied
A lofty tower, and strong on every side,
With treble walls, which Phlegethon surrounds,
Whose fiery flood the burning empire bounds,
And pressed betwixt the rocks, the bellowing noise resounds."

In the first place, this whole region is in a great measure volcanic; and not only here, but at the other side of the Bay of Pozzuoli, the evidences of it are abundant. In this very spot are the craters of two scarcely extinct, though small volcanoes. No very great stretch of imagination is required to view in their flood of burning lava the fiery stream of Phlegethon, either roaring as it rushes between rocks, or as it bears them along tumbling in its torrent, creating an appalling noise. The peasants will this day point out what they call *Fumarole*, very distinct tokens of subterraneous fires to the west of the Scalandrone, on the very site of the city of the damned, as described by the poet. Homer informs us that the Phlegethon is discharged into the Acheron and the Cocytus. Virgil was a close student of Homer, and his Phlegethon would naturally flow from the site into the Lago del Fusaro and the Aqua Morta. These volcanoes were probably much more active in the time of Virgil than we find them today. Thus, the fiery stream was a natural suggestion.

The walls of the city of Misenus presented themselves here also to the observation of the poet. Even to-day you will find scarcely a space

of three hundred yards without the ruins of some ancient Roman structure, some of them of considerable extent, many of them covered with strata of volcanic matter. You will find several caves, and Greek and Roman sepulchres, so that there was sufficient occasion to lead the imagination to a subterraneous fiery prison, the entrance to which was in a citadel surrounded by a flaming river. This was the Tartarean region, or the Hell of the poet, which was exhibited to his hero, but into which he did not enter. The fortress was impregnable, and from it issued the cries of the tortured. His guide informed him of the mode of judgment and the dire infliction of vengeance; and the hero saw the gates open, so as to enable him to describe the terrific disclosures that were thus made, and to convey the detail to those who had not been privileged as he was.

Line 577.

Tum Tartarus ipse
Bis patet in praeceps tantum, tenditque sub umbras,
Quantus ad aethereum coeli suspectus olympum.
Hic genus antiquum terrae, Titania pubes,
Fulmine dejecti, fundo volvuntur in imo.

"The gaping gulf low to the centre lies,
And twice as deep as earth is distant from the skies.
The rival of the Gods, the Titan race
Here singed with lightning roll within the unfathomed space."

Whoever has been at the Grotto del Cane, or in the hot sulphur caverns between Naples and Pozzuoli, is perfectly aware of the effect of the exhalations from this soil. Add to this the volcanic matter, the ruins of ancient tombs, the occasional shakings of the earth, and some notions may be formed of the mythological relations of the restless and tortured Titans, endeavouring to rise, and disturbing the soil under which they are buried, so as to create those fissures which emit the stench of their brimstone graves to our upper world.

The concluding lines of the poet, after the enumeration of several of the wretched culprits, are beautiful and highly instructive.

Line 617:

Sedet aeternumque sedebit
Infelix Theseus: Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes
Admovet, et magna testatur voce per umbras;
Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere Divos.
Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem
Imposuit; fixit leges pretio atque refixit.
Hic thalamum invasit natae, vetitosque hymenaeos,
Ausi omnes immane nefas, ausoque potiti
Non mihi si linguae centum sint, oraque centum,
Ferrea vox, omnes scelerum comprendere formas,
Omnia poenarum percurrere nomina possim.

"Unhappy Theseus, doomed for ever there,
Is fixed by fate on his eternal chair,
And wretched Phlegias warns the world with cries,
(Could warning make the world more just or wise,)
Learn righteousness, and dread the avenging deities.
To tyrants others have their country sold,
Imposing foreign laws for foreign gold.
Some have old laws repealed, new statutes made,
Not as the people pleased, but as they paid.
With incest some their daughters' beds profaned;
All dared the worst of ill, and what they dared, attained.
Had I a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues,
And throats of brass, inspired with iron lungs,
I could not half those horrid crimes repeat,
Nor half the punishments those crimes have met."

This was the Tartarus, or Hell, into which, as I remarked, the hero did not enter, but with a view and description of which he was favoured. The spot from which it was examined was just beyond that described as the division of the roads, *Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas,* and is now called *Croce via di Capella.* At a short distance beyond it, on the road, is the Mercato di Sabato, where formerly stood a circus, which probably suggested to the poet the following description, given by the priestess.

Line 630:

Cyclopum educta caminis
Maenia conspicio atque adverso fornice portas.

"The walls of Pluto's palace are in view;
The gate and iron arch above it stands,
On anvils laboured by the Cyclops' hands."

We have again, in a single expression of the poet, an admirable coincidence with the site:

Line 633:

Dixerat et pariter gressi per opaca viarum,
Corripiunt spatium medium, foribusque propinquant.

"She said, and through the gloomy shades they passed,
And chose the middle path."

Just here, even at this day, the road branches into three parts: that to the right leads to the western extremity of Mare Morto, where it approaches the Monte di Procida. Mythological writers inform us that the Lethe touches on the confines of the infernal regions, a portion of which was in the ravines of this mountain; and thus we may suppose this lake, which is formed by an influx from one of the deep indentings of the Bay of Pozzuoli, is the fabled Lethe itself. On the left, the road leads towards Scalandrone, and back to Averno. The Spatium Medium will

lead to the northeastern shore of the Mare Morto, or Lethe, and here are the Elysian fields; for again mythology informs us that the Lethe stretched along the borders of those happy regions. This middle path, then, was followed by the Trojan chieftain, who having performed the proper lustrations, and duly offered his golden bough, by placing it over the portal, was admitted.

The difference of the soil and the variety of productions form here a contrast with the gloomy, the sterile, the volcanic, and the rugged regions through which our way had lain before, and very naturally suggested to the Mantuan bard those happy lines.

Line 637:

His demum exactis, perfecto munere Divae,
Devenere locos laetos, et amaena vireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas.
Largior hic campos aether et lumine vestit
Purpureo: solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.

"These holy rites performed, they took their way
Where long-extended plains of pleasure lay.
The verdant fields with those of heaven may vie,
With ether vested and a purple sky;
The blissful seats of happy souls below,
Stars of their own, and their own sun they know."

The melody of the raptured poet now grows richer with the increasing grandeur of the scene, and perhaps few descriptions can be found to equal that which is given in his succeeding lines. To observe upon this, is not, however, our object. After due inquiry, he discovers the loved object of his search; their interview is in the midst of those gentle elevations, and the varying undulations which enrich this spot. The Platonic system, modified with peculiar diversities of the poet's own adoption, is beautifully unfolded—the mingling of the universal mind with matter in its various modifications, the death of man, and his judgment. They who escape Tartarus, are generally doomed to a variety of purgations, according to the stains with which they are disfigured.

Line 735:

Quin et supremo cum lumine vita relinquit
Non tamen omne malum miseris, nec funditus omnes
Corporeae excedunt pestes; penitusque necesse est
Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris,
Ergo exercentur poenis veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt.

"E'en when those bodies are by death resign'd,
Some old, inherent spots are left behind,—
A sullying tincture of corporeal stains
Deep in the substance of the soul remains.

Thus are her splendours dimmed and crusted o'er
With those dark vices that she knew before,
For this the souls a various penance pay,
To purge the taints of former crimes away."

Pitt.

Of Elysium, he proceeds then to say, after some special descriptions of the previous process of purgation:

Line 743:

Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysium, et pauci lacta arva tenemus.
"And few so cleansed to these abodes repair,
And breathe in ample fields the soft Elysian air."

However, this happiness is not to continue, for the transmigration of souls forms a part of the system.

Line 748:

Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,
Letheum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno;
Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revisant,
Rursus et incipiant in corpora velle reverti.
"Both these thin airy throngs thy eyes behold,
When o'er their heads a thousand years have rolled,
In mighty crowds to yon Lethean flood,
Swarm at the potent summons of the God,
There deep the draught of dark oblivion drain,
Then they desire new bodies to obtain,
And visit heaven's ethereal realms again."

Thus, numbers who never entered Elysium, but were detained in their state of purgation, were, according to this philosophical system, sent back with the happy souls to animate new bodies. With this view of the poet's notion of Elysium, I shall hasten to compare the few remaining passages with the topography. At the moment when Anchises was discovered by his son, the poet describes his situation.

Line 679:

At pater Anchises penitus convalle virenti
Inclusas animas superumque ad lumen ituras,
Lustrabat studio recolens: omnemque suorum
Forte recensebat numerum, charosque [vel claros] nepotes,
Fataque, fortunasque virum, moresque, manusque.
"But old Anchises in a flowery vale
Reviewed his mustered race, and took the tale:
Those happy spirits which, ordained by fate,
For future being and new bodies wait;
With studious thought observed th' illustrious throng,
In nature's order as they passed along.
Their names, their fate, their conduct and their care,
In peaceful senate and successful war."

After having gone forward from the Mercato di Sabato, and stood on one of those pretty swellings of the ground, the hollows are exposed to view, and we find Anchises thus occupied in one of those delightful spots, at some distance forward. The Mare Morto is also visible, with its open strand on the right; and it was to its banks that they who now pressed forward to re-enter mortal existence were approaching, whilst amongst them the great father of the Roman race was surveying his future progeny. Æneas went quickly forward to him, to a spot answering the description, near the northeastern extremity of this lake; and after the first efforts to embrace his parent, Virgil informs us.

Line 703:

Interea videt Æneas in valle reducta
Seclusum nemus, virgulta sonantia sylvis
Lethaeumque, domos placidas qui praenatat amnen,
Hunc circum innumerae gentes populique volabant.

"Now in a secret vale the Trojan sees
A separate grove, through which a gentle breeze
Plays with a passing breath, and whispers through the trees;
And just before the confines of the wood,
The gliding Lethe leads her silent flood,
About the boughs an airy nation flew."

And when the visitor expressed his desire to know who they were, the father answers.

Line 713:

Animae, quibus altera fato
Corpora debentur, Lethaei ad fluminis undam,
Securos latices et longa oblivia potant.

"The souls that throng the flood
Are those to whom, by fate, are other bodies owed.
In Lethe's lake they long oblivion taste;
Of future life secure, forgetful of the past."

Mentioning a desire, which he had long entertained, to give to his son the knowledge of his future descendants, he proceeds to give him that explanation to which I have before drawn your attention, of the process of man's existence and of the Platonic system.

It is here to be remarked, that at this day, the scenery at this northeastern part of the lake is described with tolerable accuracy by the passage which has been quoted before the last, if we credit many who have seen and testify it. After the doctrinal communication, if I may so call it, Anchises is desirous to bring under his son's observation the succession of heroes which he had been contemplating, and for this purpose the poet very naturally caused him to bring Æneas to a more elevated spot.

Line 732:

Dixerat Anchises: natumque unaque Sibyllam,
Conventus trahit in medios turbamque sonantem
Et tumulum capit, unde omnes longo ordine possit.
Adversos legere, et venientum discere vultus.
"Thus having said, the father spirit leads
The priestess and his son through swarms of shades,
And takes a rising ground from thence to see
The long procession of his progeny."

This is a spot called Puzzillo, and there the poet takes opportunity of giving, through Anchises, that splendid enumeration of those sages and heroes whom he desired to celebrate, until the catalogue closes with that sublime and pathetic exclamation which procured wealth and fame for the writer.

Line 882:

Heu! miserande puer! si qua fata aspera rumpas.
Tu Marcellus eris.
"Oh couldst thou shun the dreadful stroke of fate;
Rome should in thee behold, with ravished eyes,
Her pride, her darling, her Marcellus rise."

A little above Puzzillo are the ruins of ancient vast structures, and this day, in the midst of them, is the parish church of St. Anne, the vestibule of which is marked by the Canon as the spot where stood in former days, the gate which was selected by our poet as that of horn. This is on your right, and a short distance on your left is Bacoli, not far from the tomb of Agrippina; here was the gate of ivory.

Line 893:

Sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum altera fertur
Cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris:
Altera, candenti perfecta nitens elephanto:
Sed falsa ad coelum mittunt insomnia manes.
"Two gates the silent courts of sleep adorn
That of pale ivory, this of lucid horn,
Through this pale visions take their airy way.
Through that false phantoms mount the realms of day."

The Sibyl and her companion having been dismissed by Anchises through the ivory gate,

Line 899:

Ille viam secat ad naves, sociosque revisit.
"Straight to the ships Æneas took his way."

In the very expression, "secat viam," the Canon finds evidence of correctness of his illustrations, because there is a short path from Bacoli to the spot where the Trojans landed, which cuts straight across the peninsula, and at angles with the other roads over which we have gone.

Line 900:

Tum se ad Caietae recto fert litore portum.
"Then steering by the strand he ploughs the sea,
And to Caieta's port directs his way,"—

which could not have been the case from Baiæ, which is at the opposite side of the promontory from Cumæ, and within the bay of Pozzuoli; the voyage from which would require the rounding of that cape, and certainly could not be said to go *recto litore*; whereas, from the coast at Cumæ it is a plain direct course, straight along the shore to Gaeta.

I have thus endeavoured to give you the principal illustrations exhibited by the learned Italian Canon, to show that in this, which is amongst the finest books of descriptive poetry and splendid fiction, the great author was more guided than is generally imagined by a close and patient study of actual scenery. How far I have succeeded in conveying his reasoning, I cannot say; how far I have sustained my position, it is for you to judge.

DOMESTIC SLAVERY

[The series of historical pieces on the general subject of the political and moral position and relations of the Roman See, properly concludes with the well-known *Letters to Forsythe,* the last work of Dr. England, and one in which he was interrupted by death.]

LETTER I

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 29, 1840.

Sir:—Your address to the people of Georgia, dated at Fredericksburg, Va., August 29, is now before me. Appended to it is the state of the vote at the Harrisburg Convention, by which General Harrison was chosen as the candidate for the Presidency, upon whom the opponents of the present administration had determined to rally. Your object, as you declare in the address, is to show that "he was forced upon the southern portion of [the opposition] by the combination of anti-masonry and abolitionism." The exhibition of the document was intended for this purpose.

In another part of your address you advert to the conduct of Great Britain respecting slaves, and make special reference to two resolutions unanimously adopted by "the World's Convention," which met in London in the month of June last, and which you thus describe:

"Those resolutions denounce the removal of slaves from the old to the new states as an unrighteous traffic, of which 80,000 are annually victims, as exciting detestation. Surprise and abhorrence are acknowledged, that it should be protected and cherished by this government. That it involves hardness of heart in the traders, and cruelty to the negroes, is asserted; and that effectual means should be immediately taken to remove this stain from the character of this nation. Was there ever such a compound of ignorance, folly, and insolence? The brutal O'Connell was quite at home in such a convention; and his insults to the representative of a foreign government near his own, his vituperation of two of our eminent public men, were quite in harmony with the occasion. The transportation of our property from Virginia to Louisiana—the internal slave trade, mark you—is 'unrighteous,' and effectual means ought to be taken in the United States forthwith to remove the stain from this nation. What are those means? We can guess. First, prohibition by Congress of the transporta-

tion of slaves, by land or by sea, from one state to another; next, a prohibition of the sale of slaves by one man to another in the same state; and then we shall be ripe for either of the late Mr. Rufus King's or General Harrison's plan of gradual emancipation; the government purchase of the blacks by the proceeds of the public lands, or by the use of the surplus revenue,—taxes and duties being properly increased to make that surplus large enough to effectuate the object."

You place the two resolutions in your appendix also. You have, in the same address also, the following passage respecting the British government: "The same government has been lately employing itself as the volunteer or selected agent of the Pope in presenting an apostolic letter on slavery to some of the Spanish American states,—a letter which it is not at all improbable was prepared under influence proceeding from the British isles." And you place this letter upon your appendix. Do I venture a rash opinion, when I say that your object was, to show a union of sentiment, if not a co-operation hostile to southern interests, between the abolitionist supporters of General Harrison, the British government, the World's Convention, including the brutal O'Connell and his holiness the Pope? And that, therefore, all these should be held in fear and detestation by the South?

Though I have had the honour of an interview with you only once, and that several years since at Milledgeville, when you were governor of Georgia, I presume we are sufficiently acquainted, each with the character of the other, to warrant my addressing you not as a stranger. For you personally I have high regard; for your public conduct in many places of trust and honour, I have great respect; the administration in which you hold so prominent a place, has my full confidence; and did I take an active part in politics, it should have my feeble aid.

I have been opposed, elsewhere, in the performance of the duties of my spiritual office, by the leading abolitionists of the United States, upon the ground of my being a bishop in the southern slaveholding states, and for having reproved Mr. O'Connell's assaults upon our planters more than eleven years ago; and my judgment and feeling are now what they were then. Yet I do not consider Mr. O'Connell a brute, though I have often told him that his charges were unwarranted and harsh; nor do I think it would be proper to "stop his wind," though I greatly disapprove of his vituperation of our country; and as regards the anti-slavery folks in Great Britain, you may judge of my attachment to them, and my respect for their love of liberty, when I tell you, that for years, whilst I resided in Ireland under the operation of the persecuting code of Britain, I witnessed the yearly display by the anti-slavery society of the

preparation and presentation to parliament of two petitions; one for abolishing the slavery of the negroes in the West Indies, the other for riveting the chains of the white slaves in Ireland, by continuing to enforce the penal laws against the Roman Catholics. Mr. O'Connell, at that period, had, as one of his humble associates in the effort to procure the repeal of those laws, the individual who has the honour to address you at present; and frequently has that individual listened with delight to the exciting eloquence in which Mr. O'Connell portrayed the sanctimonious hypocrisy of a heartless band, that, with words of pity on the lips, with wailing in the tone, with wo upon the visage, and bigtory where the heart should have been, persisted, year succeeding year, in this course, until the Catholic extorted his partial freedom against their will! Mr. O'Connell has not, I hope, more charity than I to forgive those whom God has commanded me to forgive, if I expect pardon for my own sins; but I shall not be found with Mr. O'Connell, banded with men whom I believe to be unchanged in their principles, though not placed in the same circumstances which formerly gave a better opportunity for showing them such as they are.

I have now, sir, reduced our ground of examination to a more narrow space. That space is the letter of the Pope and its circumstances.

I assume you to have insinuated that the letter was written under influences proceeding from the British isles. Upon what do you build this insinuation? It becomes a man in your position, in such a case, to speak out, and to have no reserve. Your position affords ample opportunities of learning the influence at foreign courts. Do you know of any influence which the anti-slavery folks of the British isles had in this case? If you do, you owe it to us of the South in particular to exhibit it, and to let us know its extent, as well as its object.

Now, sir, I am of opinion that British influence has had as little connexion with this letter as Georgian influence had; because, in the first place, this is by no means a novel procedure on the part of the Holy See. The Pope tells us, that he did it from a sense of duty. "We deem that it becomes our pastoral solicitude." And though statesmen, in general, pay very little regard to the declaration of motives in state-papers, you will allow me to say that I have had repeated opportunities of satisfying my own mind as to the personal character of the present supreme Pontiff; and with me, his declaration of a motive is conclusive evidence, and settles my opinion.

The very tenor of the document shows that he acted not in a novel or unusual course, but in perfect accordance with the principle which

influenced the body over which he presides, from its very origin, during successive centuries. Why then seek, in British influence, a cause for his conduct on the present occasion?

He mentions similar acts of several of his predecessors; Pius II., in 1462, when Edward IV. was King of England, and the rival houses of York and Lancaster gave to the British people other occupation than that of interfering with the Portuguese and the negroes in Africa; Pope Paul III., who wrote in 1537, succeeded Clement VII., in whose pontificate the kingdom of England was separated from the Holy See; and it will scarcely be asserted that the apostolic letter issued by this Pope, on the 29th of May of that year, was the result of British influence. You will not say that the British, who, in 1639, were regarded as the most virulent opponents of the Holy See, had influence, and used it to procure that Pope Urban VIII. should issue a similar apostolic letter on the 22d of April, exactly the day after Charles I. had cast the lords Brook and Say into prison, and was so perplexed by the Scotch Covenanters. Nor will you venture to assert that it was British influence procured that a similar apostolic letter should be issued by Benedict XIV. in 1741, when, under George II., the execution of the penal laws against Catholics was in full vigour. And though the anti-slavery societies existed in Great Britain and Ireland during the pontificate of Pius VII., in the first portion of the present century, yet were the penal laws, to a considerable extent, also in full vigour; and you will scarcely expect us to believe that this society, which presented its annual petition for the persecution of Catholics and the abolition of negro slavery, had great influence with his holiness. Thus, sir, I give you some of the reasons for my opinion that your insinuation against the Pope is wholly without foundation.

I now proceed, sir, to establish another distinction, which I am astonished you could have overlooked. The distinction between the "slave-trade," as prohibited by the United States, and the engagement in which would be a high crime, I believe a felony, in any one of their citizens, and the continuance of "domestic slavery" in any of the states by the authority of that state, and with the existence or regulation of which the government of the United States has no concern whatsoever.

The British Anti-slavery Society, Mr. O'Connell, and the American abolitionists, are equally opposed to both, in all places, and at all times; and they specially wage war upon us at the South for the continuance of this "domestic servitude." The Pope neither mentions nor alludes to this latter in his apostolic letter, which is directed, as were those of his predecessors, solely and exclusively against the former. Yet, sir, you

confound his letter with the deeds of the societies; and you use the vague expression, "an apostolic letter on slavery," instead of the precise one, "against being engaged in the slave-trade," which we should expect from so able and experienced a diplomatist, holding for years the high office of secretary of state of these confederated republics.

I should suppose, sir, that, to a deeply read and experienced statesman, who has been in Italy, Spain, and I believe other parts of Europe, not merely for idle tour-making, but engaged with courts on public business, the precise and fixed meaning of the expression, "traffic in negroes," would be as familiar as "household words:" and that Mr. Forsyth would not stand in need of being reminded by me, that, in the language of continental Europe, it is precisely and exclusively what the United States knows as criminal trading in slaves; that it is not at all applicable to what is known amongst us as "domestic slavery." The Roman Catholic Church, which is that of those nations to which I more particularly allude, has always observed this distinction; and it is one as obvious as that which exists between the words "foreign" and "domestic." [30]

The Pope's letter specially describes the traffic, in three places. In one it says, "reduced (in remote lands) Indians, negroes and other unfortunate beings, into slavery." This is the first ingredient in the crime, viz.: "reducing those who were free into slavery," and this in remote lands, which belonged to those so reduced into slavery, and by foreign invaders. The citizens of Georgia have not reduced any such persons into slavery. The letter then designates another class as criminal by becoming accessories, "or the traffic in those who had been made captive, by others who did not hesitate to encourage or profit by such

[30] Domestic Slavery is not opposed to the law of nature. It is every man's natural right to sell to another all his producing power, so that the buyer shall become the sole and perpetual master of all the working capabilities of the one bought. However, always unlawful is the slavery which would claim full dominion over the person of the slave. So that the person would be regarded as a mere commodity.

The Church has never approved any form of slavery. In this matter her position has always been that of hostility. In a letter which Leo XIII. on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee, wrote the Bishops of Brazil, he clearly enunciates the attitude of the Church on the question of slavery. The Great Pontiff speaks for the equality of all men—equality of natural origin—equality of adoption as children of God—equality as members of the same body and partakers of the same divine table. He declares that the opposition of the Church to paganism meant the assertion of individual liberty over against individual slavery. "Condemnation" and "Toleration" are the terms used by Leo XIII. to express his full views regarding slavery. "Approbation" is not found in his letter. When slavery presents itself as an existing fact which can be removed only at the great disadvantage of the slaves and to the detriment of the government, then the Pope declares existing conditions must be tolerated and the slaves are held to practice patience and forbearance. Prudent opposition to slavery, Leo declares, marks the history of the Church.—Ed.

unworthy actions;''—now by the laws of the United States since the year 1808, it would be criminal in one of our citizens to go to Africa and there reduce a negro to slavery, from freedom, or to purchase and ship for a foreign port a negro so enslaved by another, or to introduce him into Georgia or any other place in the United States. This is what is commonly known as the ''slave-trade'' or ''traffic in negroes,'' and this is precisely what these several Popes reprehended and declared to be unlawful.

In the next place it is described by an extract from the letters of Pope Urban VIII., in precisely similar terms, who ''reduce into slavery,'' evidently contemplating persons previously free, and then respecting ''the same persons;'' that is, those who had been ''reduced into'' slavery; ''buy, sell, exchange,'' or ''give them away; separate them from their wives and children;'' the next expressions could not be, by any effort of ingenuity, used respecting ''domestic slaves,'' such as are in our states, ''despoil them of their goods, or possessions,'' because in the canon law as well as in the civil law, the *mancipium* or ''domestic slave,'' had no property or possession, except what was permitted to him as a *peculium* or ''allowance.'' ''Carry or send them to other regions,'' which is incompatible with ''domestic slavery,'' but precisely the character of the ''slave-trade,'' ''or in any manner deprive them of their liberty,'' which the domestic slave never had, and of which he could not be deprived, ''retain them,'' that is, those deprived of their liberty, ''in servitude,'' and so forth.

I now proceed to show from the enacting words, if I may use the expression, of the apostolical letter of his holiness, Pope Gregory XVI. that only the ''slave-trade'' is condemned.

It ''admonishes'' and ''conjures earnestly'' in the Lord—1. Not to molest ''unjustly.'' 2. Not to despoil of ''their'' goods. 3. Not to ''reduce into slavery,'' negroes or any other race of men. 4. Not to render countenance or assistance to those guilty of such practices. 5. Not to be engaged in the sale or purchase, in the inhuman commerce by which negroes are sometimes devoted to intolerable labour. That this commerce is what our laws condemn as the ''slave-trade,'' and not that sale and purchase which must frequently occur in domestic slavery, is manifest from the consequence which is described, following as a matter of course from the traffic, ''through the love of gain held out to the first possessors of the negroes,'' that is, the African chieftains; ''dissensions and perpetual wars are fomented throughout the regions which they inhabit,''—and upon all these considerations he prohibits the teaching that ''this traffic in negroes,'' that is, the ''slave-trade'' is lawful.

Thus, sir, it is manifest that you would be equally justified in placing our federal government, under the administration of Mr. Van Buren, and yourself, in company with British and American abolitionists, as you were in placing his holiness Pope Gregory XVI. there. Is it not a little strange, sir, that whilst you exhibit him, and by implication me and my flock, as allied with the abolitionists,—the abolitionists themselves, by a select division to whom it was entrusted in New York, drew up a petition which they forwarded to Hayti for signatures, and which was presented to President Boyer, by the general of division at Port au Prince, requesting that no communication should be held with me as envoy from this same Pope Gregory XVI., upon the ground that he was not averse to southern slavery, and that I was an enemy to Daniel O'Connell, and an enemy to negroes? Yes, sir, in a conversation which I held with President Boyer, he acknowledged to me the receipt of the petition, when, to spare him the trouble of an examination to discover my sentiments, I informed him that I was aware of the origin and history of the document, and had requested the interview for the purpose of giving him the necessary explanation. He has more common sense than most of the abolitionists, and makes more just allowance for the position of the southern planters than do their fellow-citizens; and he had the candour and honour to declare that though he must deprecate slavery in every shape, yet from what I told him, he was happy to feel that there were great humanity and very creditable feelings of kindness to their slaves in the great bulk of the southern proprietors, and he added, that he would be devoid of every principle of honour were he to deny the kindness and affection of many of the Spanish proprietors to their slaves in the eastern part of Hayti, previous to the revolution.

This, sir, is the fate of the Catholics of the United States; they are the shuttlecock for the parties of the republics,—threatened by the myrmidons of General Harrison's party to-day, and placed in a false position by Mr. Van Buren's secretary of state the next moment. There is, however, sir, one at least of that body who will not submit to the infliction from either one party or the other, from friend or from foe, without endeavouring, however humble his place in the republic, and however powerless his pen, at least to demand more just conduct towards the body to which he has the honour to belong, even though he may not succeed in obtaining what he seeks.

In my next, sir, I shall give additional reasons to show that our holy father, Pope Gregory XVI., is not the associate of the abolitionists,

and that the Catholics of the South should not be rendered objects of suspicion to their fellow-citizens.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 7, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I proceed to give additional reasons to show that the letter of our holy father, Pope Gregory XVI., regarded only the "slave-trade." At the late council in Baltimore, that document was formally read and accepted by the prelates of the United States. Did it contain anything contrary to their judgment, respecting faith or morals, it would have been their duty to have respectfully sent their statement of such difference to the Holy See, together with their reasons for such dissent. Did they believe it contained the correct exposition of Christian morality, and were aware that in the ecclesiastical province of the United States, under their charge, there existed practices in opposition to that exposition, it would have been their duty to use their best efforts to have such practices discontinued, and to refuse sacraments to those who would persevere in the immoral conduct which it denounced.

Thus, if this document condemned our domestic slavery as an unlawful and consequently immoral practice, the bishops could not have accepted it without being bound to refuse the sacraments to all who were slaveholders unless they manumitted their slaves; yet, if you look to the prelates who accepted the document, for the acceptation was immediate and unanimous: you will find, 1st, the Archbishop of Baltimore, who is also the administrator of Richmond, having charge of the slaveholding territory of the states of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia; 2d, the Bishop of Bardstown, having charge of the slaveholding state of Kentucky; 3d, the Bishop of Charleston, having charge of the slaveholding states of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; 4th, the Bishop of St. Louis, having charge of the slaveholding states of Missouri and Arkansas; 5th, the Bishop of Mobile, having charge of the slaveholding state of Alabama and the Territory of Florida; 6th, the Bishop of New Orleans, having charge of the slaveholding states of Louisiana and Mississippi; and, 7th, the Bishop of Nashville, having charge of the slaveholding state of Tennessee. They formed a majority of the council, and were in charge of all the slaveholding por-

tion of the Union. Amongst the most pious and religious of their flocks, are large slaveholders, who are most exact in performing all their Christian duties, and who frequently receive the sacraments. The prelates, under whose charge they are, have never, since the day on which they accepted this letter, indicated to them the necessity of, in any manner, adopting any new rule of conduct respecting their slaves. Nor did the other six prelates, under whose charge neither slaves nor slaveholders are found, express to their brethren any new views upon the subject, because they all regarded the letter as treating of the "slave-trade," and not as touching "domestic slavery."

I believe, sir, we may consider this to be pretty conclusive evidence as to the light in which that document is viewed by the Roman Catholic Church.

Since the issuing of this document, the Holy See has been in treaty with Portugal, which has, first and last, been most deeply engaged in this cruel traffic, and I have good reason to believe that one of the stipulations without which the Holy See will not conclude the treaty is, that the Portuguese government will act as ours did upwards of thirty years since, and prohibit this desolating, criminal, and inhuman system of murder, ruin, and desolation. What southern planter would deliberately sanction a system of which the following passage of a letter, from a highly creditable person, is but the description of a trifling appendage?

SIERRA LEONE, June 18, 1840.

"The slave-trade is by no means extinguished upon this coast; it is, however, more covertly conducted. From the most accurate sources of information, I can fairly state that one out of seven slaveships is caught by the British cruisers. There is more secrecy, but the trade is nearly as frequent as before, but more profitable, and for that reason more alluring. A few days ago I visited a captured slaver. In a space which a moderate sized French bedstead would occupy, I have seen forty-five unhappy wretches packed, without regard to age or constitution, like herrings in a barrel. I saw them fed after they had been captured. On a shell about the size of a half crown piece, was deposited a pinch of salt, for which a father and four children contended, each endeavouring to scramble a portion to eat with his rice. I have seen four children packed in a cask I thought it impossible to contain one."

It is against this desperate traffic, in which Portugal and Spain [31]

[31] Spain.—We are desired by Bishop England to state that in mentioning Spain and Portugal as concerned in the "slave-trade," he did not mean to deny that the Spanish government had, in 1825, legally abolished the traffic; but nothing is more notorious than the continued introduction of negroes from Africa into the ports of her colonies by the connivance of her officers, for whom the prohibition and the introduction produce large incomes.

Not only is Spain thus made a participator, but we have had given to us the names of zealous and noisy abolitionists at the North, who we are told make largely at the present day by the traffic. We have ourselves seen in ports in the United States, within ten years, several vessels fitted out evidently for this trade, and notor-

have had so enormous a share, that the Pope's letter is directed, and not against domestic slavery, [of] the existence of which he is conscious, but respecting which he uses no action, and which rests upon a totally different basis, as it is perfectly unconnected with cruelty such as is above described.

If you will permit myself, sir, to be a witness in this case, I can inform you, that in different audiences which I had of his holiness upon the subject of religion in Hayti, I urged, amongst other topics, to induce him to make a selection of a different person as his envoy, my peculiar position; I stated that my being a bishop of the diocess, within the limits of which was contained the most numerous negro slave population that is to be found in any diocess in the world, would render me unacceptable to the Haytian government, and that being engaged to transact the ecclesiastical organization of that island, would probably render me unacceptable in my own diocess. His holiness met me by stating the very distinction to which I have been drawing your attention. "Though the Southern States of your Union have had domestic slavery as an heirloom, whether they would or not, they are not engaged in the negro traffic," that is, the "slave-trade."

Thus, sir, I trust I have succeeded in showing that this letter of his holiness which you described to be "an apostolic letter on slavery"—does, in fact, regard only that "slave-trade" which the United States condemn, and not that domestic slavery which exists in our Southern States.

But, sir, I regard this subject as one of great moment at the present time, and likely to become much more troublesome before many years shall elapse; I shall, therefore, enter more deeply upon its elucidation.

Respecting domestic slavery, we distinguish it from the compulsory slavery of an invaded people in its several degrees. I shall touch upon the varieties separately. The first is "voluntary;" that which exists amongst us is not of that description, though I know very many instances where I have found it to be so; but I regard not the cases of individuals, I look to the class. In examining the lawfulness of voluntary slavery, we shall test a principle against which abolitionists contend. They assert, generally, that slavery is contrary to the natural law. The soundness of their position will be tried by inquiring into the lawfulness of holding in slavery a person, who has voluntarily sold himself. Our

---

iously employed in it, and owned by our Northern merchants, but against which legal proof could not be exhibited.

If our information be correct, and we have reason to think it is, several of the prominent abolitionists participate in worse cruelty than is known to the planter.—*Misc.*, vol. xx., p. 119.

theological authors lay down a principle, that man in his natural state is master of his own liberty, and may dispose of it as he sees proper; as in the case of a Hebrew, (*Exodus* xxi. 5,) who preferred remaining with his wife and children as a slave, to going into that freedom to which he had a right; and as in the case of the Hebrew, (*Levit.* xxv. 47,) who, by reason of his poverty, would sell himself to a sojourner or to a stranger. Life and its preservation are more valuable than liberty, and hence when Esther addresses Assuerus, (vii. 4,) she lays down the principle very plainly and naturally. "For we are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed and slain, and to perish. But if we had been sold for bondsmen and bondswomen, I had held my tongue." The natural law then does not prohibit a man from bartering his liberty and his services to save his life, to provide for his sustenance, to secure other enjoyments which he prefers to that freedom and to that right to his own labour, which he gives in exchange for life and protection. Nor does the natural law prohibit another man from procuring and bestowing upon him those advantages, in return for which he has agreed to bind himself to that other man's service, provided he takes no unjust advantage in the bargain. Thus a state of voluntary slavery is not prohibited by the law of nature; that is, a state in which one man has the dominion over the labour and the ingenuity of another to the end of his life, and consequently in which that labour and ingenuity are the property of him who has the dominion, and are justly applicable to the benefit of the master and not of the slave. All our theologians have from the earliest epoch sustained, that though in a state of pure nature all men are equal, yet the natural law does not prohibit one man from having dominion over the useful action of another as his slave; provided this dominion be obtained by a just title. That one man may voluntarily give this title to another, is plain from the principle exhibited, and from the divine sanction to which I have alluded.

In one point of view, indeed, we may say that the natural law does not establish slavery, but it does not forbid it—and I doubt how far any of the advocates of abolition would consent to take up for refutation, the following passage of St. Thomas of Aquin,—(1, 2, q. 94, a. 5, ad. 2).

"The common possession of all things is said to be of the natural law, because the distinction of possessions and slavery were not introduced by nature, but by the reason of man, for the benefit of human life: and thus the law of nature is not changed by their introduction, but an addition is made thereto."

As well may the wealthy merchant then assert, that it is against the law of nature that one man should possess a larger share of the common fund belonging to the human family for his exclusive benefit, as

that it is against the law of nature for one man to be the slave of another. The existence of slavery is considered by our theologians to be as little incompatible with the natural law as is the existence of property. The sole question will be in each case, whether the title on which the dominion is claimed be valid.

I know many slaves who would not accept their freedom; I know some who have refused it; and though our domestic slavery must upon the whole be regarded as involuntary, still the exceptions are not so few as are imagined by strangers.

It may be asked why any one should prefer slavery to freedom. I know many instances where the advantages to the individual are very great; and so, sir, I am confident do you, yet I am not in love with the existence of slavery. I would never aid in establishing it where it did not exist. St. Thomas gives very briefly one of the principles upon which the answer may rest, and Aristotle, sustains him (in I *Polit.* c. 3 circa fin. T. 5,) in his view. St. Thomas is proving that the laws of nations is distinct from the natural law, and answering an assertion that slavery is of the natural law, because some men are naturally fitted for slavery.

"This man is a slave, absolutely speaking, rather a son, not by any natural cause, but by reason of the benefits which are produced, for it is more beneficial to this one to be governed by one who has more wisdom, and to the other to be helped by the labour of the former. Hence the state of slavery belongs principally to the law of nations, and to the natural law only in the second degree, not in the first. (2. 2. q. 57. a. 3. ad. 2)."

The situation of a slave, under a humane master, insures to him food, raiment, and dwelling, together with a variety of little comforts; it relieves him from the apprehensions of neglect in sickness, from all solicitude for the support of his family, and in return, all that is required is fidelity and moderate labour. I do not deny that slavery has its evils, but the above are no despicable benefits. Hence I have known many freedmen who regretted their manumission.

In examining the case of the voluntary slave, sir, we have then discovered some of the grounds upon which Catholic divines, however they may deprecate its existence, teach that slavery is perfectly compatible with the natural law, and that it has been introduced by the law of nations.

It will be useful to draw your attention, sir, to another distinction made by our divines, and which many of our speculative philosophers disregard. The natural state of man, in the day of his innocence, was very different from that in which he is placed since his fall; and the good gentlemen, in their abstractions, appear to forget the consequences

of that original transgression. Death, sickness, and a large train of what are now called natural evils, are by Roman Catholics considered to be the consequences of sin. Slavery is an evil and is also a consequence of sin. Thus St. Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, A. D. 425, in his book *Of the City of God*, liber xix. caput 15, informs us that slavery is the consequence of sin. "The condition of slavery is justly regarded as imposed upon the sinner. Hence we never read slave in the Scriptures before the just Noe, by his word, punished the sin of his son. Sin, not nature, thus introduced the word."

St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, A. D. 390, in his book *On Elias and Fasting*, caput v. "There would be no slavery to-day, had there not been drunkenness." And St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 400, Homily xxix. *In Genesis*: "Behold brethren born of the same mother; sin makes one of them a servant, and taking away his liberty, lays him under subjection." I could multiply quotations, but it is not requisite. Catholic divines are agreed in the principle that the origin of slavery, as of all our infirmities and afflictions, is to be found in sin. Hence it is overlooking one of the essential ingredients in our present condition, for a person who believes in the fall of man, as every Catholic must, to reason upon abstract speculations without taking this important fact into consideration. And besides looking generally at this fact and its results, he should also consider the full force of the sentence (*Gen.* ix. 25), "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." Let him add to this the two succeeding verses, in which Sem and Japheth are promised the service of Canaan. It certainly was not then against the divine law for Sem and Japheth to use the service of Canaan.

Pope Gelasius I., A. D. 491, in his letters to the bishops of the Picene territory, the present march of Ancona, in Italy, writing against the Pelagian heresy, states slavery to have been a consequence of sin, and to have been established by human law.—Labbe iv. 1176—E. And in the book xix., *On the City of God*, chapter 16, St. Augustin argues at length to show that the peace and good order of society, as well as religious duty, demand that the wholesome laws of the state regulating the conduct of the slaves, should be conscientiously observed.

Slavery, then, sir, is regarded by that church of which the Pope is the presiding officer, not to be incompatible with the natural law, to be the result of sin by divine dispensation, to have been established by human legislation, and when the dominion of the slave is justly acquired by the master to be lawful, not only in the sight of the human tribunal, but also in the eye of Heaven; but not so the "slave-trade,"

or the reducing into slavery the African and Indian in the manner that Portugal and Spain sanctioned, which they continue in many instances still to perpetrate, and which the apostolic letters have justly censured as unlawful.

The distinction will, I trust, be rendered more obvious as I proceed.

I am, sir, respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 13, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I now proceed to examine the titles which divines and canonists have considered to be good and valid for the possession of a slave.

In their definitions and remarks they always restrict that dominion to what is called service of the body, not of the soul, which latter was not held in bondage.

The slave was accountable to God for his morality, and hence the master could not require him to lay aside the practice of religion, or to do an immoral act, but he could command his labour, and was bound to give the necessaries of life.

Bergier very properly remarks, (*Dict. Theolog.* Art. Esclave,) that in the wandering state of early tribes and families, where civil society had yet been scarcely, and in only a few places established, a servant could not change his master without expatriation, nor could a master send away his servants without destroying his family, and in this state of things domestic slavery became inevitable. It was, however, he remarks, very greatly mitigated under the patriarchal government, and he instances one great benefit which would accrue, though certainly very seldom to the servant. *Genesis* xv. 2: "And Abraham said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me? I shall go without children: and the son of the steward of my house is this Damascus Eliezer. 3. And Abraham added: but to me thou hast not given seed; and lo my servant born in my house shall be my heir."

He adds, that civil liberty became a benefit, only after the establishment of civil society, when man had the protection of law, and multiplied facilities for subsistence: that previous to this, absolute freedom would be an injury to a person bereft of flocks, herds, lands, and servants; hence, that Abraham and the other patriarchs held great numbers of slaves, whom they treated with parental care, and governed by whole-

some discipline, and whose services were absolutely the property of their masters.

Job possessed slaves, and treated them with kindness, xxxi. 13: "If I have despised to abide judgment with my man-servant, or my maid-servant, when they had controversy against me. 14. For what shall I do, when God will rise to judge? And when he shall examine, what shall I answer him? 15. Did not he that made me in the womb, make him also, and did not one and the same form us in the womb?"

How came these patriarchs to have property in those slaves? Many of them were born in their houses, that is, of their servants, and this was acknowledged to be a good title, not only by the law of nations, but clearly, in the case before us, by the law of God. But how were their parents slaves? Perhaps originally they voluntarily became so. They might also have been bought from others who had acquired a just dominion, by that or by some other good title. I am now only treating of the title which rests on birth, the validity of which the patriarchs thus testified. In Genesis xiv. 14, we find Abraham arming three hundred and eighteen of his trained servants born in his house, to accompany him to the rescue of Lot. In chapter xv., we find Eliezer Damascus, his servant born in his house. In chapter xvi., we find Agar, the Egpytian, a maid or slave of Sarai, whom she introduced as a wife of an inferior rank to Abraham. In chapter xxi., we find this bondswoman, or slave of Sarai, together with her son Ishmael, who was the slave equally as he was the son of Abraham, sent away by the direction of her mistress Sarai, as in chapter xvi., we find that Abraham declared to Sarai, "Behold thy handmaid is thy own hand, use her as it pleaseth thee." Grotius says it was a concession of power even to put her to death, and St. John Chrysostom, Homily 37, describes it as an unlimited power of punishment for petulance and insubordination; which Calmet, in his remarks on this place, says every master had over his slave, and every husband had over the slave of his wife. In chapter xvii., when God is making a covenant with Abraham, he recognises the validity of this title to servitude by birth. 12. "He that is born in the house, as well as the bought servant, shall be circumcised." 23. "Then Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all whom he had bought, every male among the men of his house, and he circumcised the flesh of their foreskin forthwith the very same day, as God had commanded him." 27. "And all the men of his house, as well they that were born in his house, as the bought servants and strangers, were circumcised with him."

Thus God himself recognised the validity of the title to a slave founded upon purchases, as well as upon birth.

The title by donation or gift, is equally plain as is that by purchase. *Genesis* xx. 14: "And Abimelech took sheep, and oxen and servants and handmaids, and gave to Abraham." They accompanied their mistress upon marriage. (*Gen.* xxiv. 61.) We may observe the same in *Genesis* xxx. 43; xxxi. 21.

The titles thus seen are, fair purchase, or gift, and birth.

When Moses led the people from Egypt, the Lord himself gave to him, in the desert, laws not only for morality, but also for the ritual service of religion, and a civil or political code.

I shall dwell very briefly upon this latter: but I shall previously remark, that in the great moral code known as the *Decalogue*, the Almighty recognises the legitimate existence of slavery. *Exodus* xx. 10: "But on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; thou shalt do no work on it, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates." 17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house; neither shalt thou desire his wife, nor his servant, nor his handmaid; nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his."

In the political or civil legislation, of which God himself is the author, we find provision made for—

1. The temporary slavery of the Hebrew. *Exodus* xxi. 2: "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee: and in the seventh he shall go free, for nothing." *Leviticus* xxv. 39: "If thy brother constrained by poverty, sell himself to thee, thou shalt not oppress him with the service of bond servants. 40. But he shall be with thee as a hireling and a sojourner: he shall work with thee until the year of the jubilee. 41. And afterwards he shall go out with his children, and shall return to his kindred and the possession of his fathers. 42. For they are my servants, and I brought them out of the land of Egypt: let them not be sold as bondsmen. 43. Afflict him not by might, but fear thy God."

2. Provision was made for his clothing and his family, *Exodus* xxi. 3: "With what raiment he came in, with the like let him go out: if having a wife, his wife shall go out with him." *Leviticus* xxv. 41: "He shall go out with his children." Thus the Hebrew could sell only his labour until the year of the jubilee, because God bestowed upon him a special right. 42. His wife and children were free; and Calmet, quoting Selden, (li. 6, c. i. *de jure nat. et gent.*,) states that the master was obliged to support the family.

3. Provision was made for his relief, at the time of completing his servitude. *Deuteronomy* xv. 1: "In the seventh year thou shalt make a remission." 12. "When thy brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman is sold to thee, and hath served thee six years, in the seventh thou shalt let him go free. 13. And when thou sendest him out free, thou shalt not let him go away empty. 14. But shalt give him for his way, out of thy flock, and out of thy barn floor, and thy wine-press, wherewith the Lord thy God shall bless thee. 15. Remember that thou wast also a bond servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God made thee free; and therefore I now command thee this." 18. "Turn not away thy eyes from them, when thou makest them free: because he hath served thee six years, according to the wages of a hireling: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the works thou dost."

4. Provision was made for the case of his marrying a slave. *Exodus* xxi. 4: "But if his master give him a wife, and she hath borne him sons and daughters, the woman and her children shall be her master's; but he himself shall go out with his raiment."

5. Provision was made for the man's continuance in servitude, should he prefer it to his liberty, in order to remain with his enslaved wife and children. *Exodus* xxi. 5: "And if the servant shall say: I love my master, and my wife and children. I will not go out free. 6. His master shall bring him to the gods (judges), and he shall be set to the door and the posts, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl: and he shall be his servant for ever." *Deuteronomy* xv. 16: "But if he say: I will not depart: because he loveth thee and thy house, and findeth that he is well with thee: 17. Thou shalt take an awl, and bore through his ear in the door of thy house; and he shall serve thee for ever: thou shalt do in like manner to thy woman-servant also."

6. Provision was made for the case of a Hebrew who sold himself in servitude to a stranger. The desire of the great legislator of this people was, to keep them separate from the other nations, and especially to preserve the integrity of their religion, by preventing their falling under the dominion of the idolatrous people by whom they were surrounded. Hence the greatest care was taken to prevent servitude to strangers, and to facilitate, without injustice, the redemption of those who became its subjects. Thus it was regulated. *Leviticus* xxv. 47: "If the hand of the stranger or a sojourner grow strong among you, and thy brother, being impoverished, sell himself to him or to any of his race. 48. After the sale, he may be redeemed. He that will of his brethren may redeem him." The following verses show the power

the servant had of redeeming himself, by paying at the rate of the hire of a servant, in the ratio of the time to the jubilee. And an injunction was given not to permit the stranger to treat him with cruelty; at all events, he was to be free in the year of the jubilee.

7. Provision was made for fugitive slaves under peculiar circumstances. (*Deut.* xxiii. 15, 16.)

8. Hebrew parents were permitted, under certain circumstances, to sell their children to their own brethren. Special provisions are made for the treatment of young females thus sold. *Exodus* xxi. 7: She was to be treated differently from a bondwoman. 8. The buyer could sell her, but not to a foreigner. 9. If his son marries her, she shall be treated as his daughter. 10. If she be set aside for another wife, she must be fully provided for. 11. Should there be a neglect of any of these conditions, she became free.

9. The Hebrews were allowed to have foreigners and their descendants in perpetual slavery. *Leviticus* xxv. 44: "Let your bondmen and bond women be of the nations that are round about you. 45. And of the strangers that sojourn among you, or those that were born of them in your land, these you shall have for servants." 49. "And by right of inheritance, shall leave them to your posterity, and shall possess them for ever."

10. Where slavery did not exist, there could not be the crime which is made capital in *Exodus* xxi. 16: "He that shall steal a man and sell him, being convicted of the guilt, shall be put to death;" and in *Deuteronomy* xiv. 7: "If any man be found soliciting his brother of the children of Israel, and selling him, shall take a price, he shall be put to death, and thou shalt take away the evil from the midst of thee."

11. The excesses of masters in the punishment of slaves were provided against by the law in *Exodus* xxi. 20 and 21: "He that striketh his bondman or bondwoman with a rod, and they die under his hands, shall be guilty of the crime. But if the party remain alive a day or two, he shall not be subject to the punishment, because it is his money." And again in v. 26 and 27: "If any man strike the eye of his man-servant or maid-servant, and leave them but one eye, he shall let them go free for the eye which he put out. Also, if he strike a tooth out of his man-servant or his maid-servant, he shall in like manner make them free."

12. Compensation was provided for the masters whose slaves had been injured. (*Exodus* xxi.) Of a wicked ox that was known to be dangerous, 52: "If he assault a bondsman or bondswoman, the owner

of the ox shall give thirty sicles of silver (the usual price of an ordinary slave) to their master, and the ox shall be stoned."

13. In the precepts relating to the observance of religious ceremonies, as well as respecting the sabbath, the eternal Lawgiver draws the distinction between the free and the slave, *Deuteronomy* xii. 11: "In the place which the Lord your God shall choose, that his name may be therein. Thither shall you bring all the things that I command you, holocausts, and victims, and tithes, and the first fruits of your hands, and whatsoever is the choicest in the gifts which you shall vow to the Lord. 12. There shall you feast before the Lord your God, you, and your sons and daughters, your men-servants and your maid-servants, and the Levite that dwelleth in your cities." The same distinction is repeated in v. 18, and in *Deuteronomy* xxi. 11, 14.

I may now enumerate several titles of dominion plainly expressed, or manifestly adverted to in this code emanating from God himself.

1. A man disposes of his own liberty. (*Exodus* xxi. 5; *Levit.* xxv. 39; *Deut.* xv. 15.) I am aware that Judge Blackstone and Montesquieu appear to contend against the right of any man to sacrifice his liberty. It is by assuming the existence of a parallelism which does not exist, viz.: that liberty is an equal good with life, and because man has not the power of disposing of the latter, he has, therefore, no power to dispose of the former.

The divine legislation of the Hebrews is, however, quite decisive.

2. A person born in servitude. (*Exodus* xxi. 4; *Levit.* xxv. 45, 46.)

3. Children sold by their parents. (*Exodus* xvi. 7; *Isaiah* l. 1.)

4. Thieves unable to make restitution and pay the penalty legally inflicted. (*Exodus* xxii. 3.)

5. We find that a creditor could also take his debtor or his children to serve for the redemption of the debt. (*IV* or *II Kings*, chap. iv.)

6. Purchase is recognised throughout as a good title to the services of one already enslaved.

7. Slaves were made in war. (*Deut.* xx. v. 14.)

Thus, sir, all the divines of the Roman Catholic Church acknowledge that they find, in the divine legislation for the Hebrew people, the recognition of slavery, and the enactment of provisions for its regulation.

It was not contrary to the law of nature, or else the God of nature could not have permitted its sanction in that code which he gave to his chosen people. It was not incompatible with the practice of pure and undefiled religion—because it was, at least, permitted by Him who is the

great and sole object of the highest religious homage. It was, in many cases, rather a source of protection than of evil to its unfortunate subjects.

St. Augustin, as I before remarked, in my last, stated that slavery was a consequence of sin, (lib. xix. *De civitate Dei.* cap. 15.) Not that the sinful individual is always the slave, but that this evil was inflicted upon a sinful world, as were sickness, war, famine, and so forth, whereby it often happens that the less sinful are afflicted, that they may, by such chastisement, be turned more to the service of God, and brought to his enjoyment. He refers to the example of Daniel and his companions in the Babylonian captivity, whereby Israel was brought to repentance. And he shows, from the etymology of the name *Servus*, that, according to the law of nations at the time, the conqueror had at his disposal the lives of his captives, some of whom were *servati* or *servi*, that is, kept from destruction, and their lives spared upon the condition of doing works of laborious drudgery for their masters.

In his chapter 16, he shows the distinction in bodily employment and labour between the son and the servant; but as regards the soul, each was equally under the master's care, and deserved a like protection. Hence, the masters were called *Patres Familias*, or "Fathers of the Household," to show that they should consult for the eternal welfare of their slaves as a father for that of his children. And he insists upon the right and obligation of the master to restrain his slaves from vice, to preserve due discipline, to govern with firmness and yet with affection. And not only by verbal correction, but if, unfortunately, it should be requisite, with moderate, corporeal chastisement; not merely for the punishment of delinquency, but also for a salutary monition to others. He proceeds still farther to show that it is a public duty, because the peace of a vicinage depends upon the good order of its families; and the safety of a state depends upon peace and discipline of all the vicinages within its precincts.

Thus he exhibits the principles that pervaded the code given by God himself to the Hebrew people.

I shall continue, sir, to treat the progress of legitimate slavery in its subsequent history.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 21, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—The divine sanction for the existence of slavery, and for the various titles by which property in slaves may be acquired, being shown, it would rest upon those who deny its religious legality to-day, to prove distinctly that this sanction had been withdrawn. Nor would it answer their purpose to plead that the political and civil code of Judea was not to be obligatory upon Christians, because we do not assert their obligation upon us; but we declare that they contained no sanction incompatible with the natural law, or the principles of sound morality; and they did contain the sanction of slavery, and if the titles of acquisition, which, we say, cannot therefore be immoral, unless they be incompatible with laws subsequently enacted. This enactment is to be proved by those who oppose us, and must be, at least, as plain as what we have exhibited.

The view which I have taken was confined to Judea,—because it was only there I could procure distinct and direct evidence of the divine sanction. Nor was this a privilege of that people, because we find it in existence previous to the formation of the Hebrew nation. Abimelec, the cotemporary of their great progenitor, gave slaves to Abraham; and as he could not convey a better title than existed in himself, if he did not lawfully own the slaves, Abraham could not lawfully accept them. Bathuel was not a Hebrew, and he had slaves, some of whom accompanied his daughter Rebecca. Laban was not a Hebrew, nor was Job. It was not then a privilege granted to the Hebrew people, nor to Abraham and his progeny, but it was a common right, and subject to the legislative regulation of nations.

Its existence was very extensive, if not universal,—and the regulations concerning it varied in the several states and nations. The exhibition of their difference would be an idle and useless display of references to the various codes and customs of the Gentile world. The number of slaves was very great. In Attica, at one period, when the citizens did not amount to thirty thousand, the slaves were four hundred thousand; this disparity in numbers was not, however, a fair representation of the world, nor even of Greece itself. The generally acknowledged titles, by the law of nations, were purchase, birth, conviction, or capture in just war.

It will be well to observe in this place, and the principle will be of essential importance in examining the apostolic letters of the Holy See, that war waged for that mere pretext of making slaves,—or under other

pretexts, but for that purpose,—was always considered to be as notoriously piratical as would be incursions made for the purpose of obtaining any other booty; nay, in this case it was worse than any other kind of robbery. The stealing of freemen and selling them into slavery, or invading a people for the purpose of reducing them to slavery, were considered great crimes; the individuals who were thus guilty, were, in almost every place, liable to capital punishment; and if a nation committed the crime, it was considered to have lost its rank of civilization. The capture should have been made in war properly waged, and carried on according to the usage of civilized nations; and in most cases the captive could, if he had property, redeem himself, or be ransomed by his friends, and thus saved from slavery.

Any person conversant with the history of the Gentile nations previous to the Christian epoch, will immediately perceive the striking contrast between the comparatively happy situation of the slaves of the Hebrews, and the oppression under which those of the most polished amongst the other nations laboured. Yet the writings of some of these latter servants form no inconsiderable share of our classical collections.

I shall then pass over any view of the slave system of the Gentiles farther than to remark, that at the period when the Saviour came, it was exceedingly oppressive; and that, in many instances, the master could put his slave to death without the interference of any legal tribunals, and that the instances of its infliction were by no means rare. I shall not stop to inquire into the validity of the claims to the exercise of this power, nor into the moral criminality of those who use it.

I proceed to examine what the divine legislator of Christianity has done upon this subject.

He made no special law, either to repeal or to modify the former and still subsisting right; but he enforced principles that, by their necessary operation and gradual influence, produced an extensive amelioration. In the words of the apostolic letter of Pope Gregory XVI., "Verily, when the light of the Gospel first began to diffuse itself, those unfortunate men, who, by occasion of so many wars, had fallen into cruel servitude, felt their condition among Christians very much alleviated. Inspired, indeed, by the divine Spirit, the Apostles taught servants to render obedience to their masters in the flesh, as unto Christ, and to do the will of God with a cheerful mind; yet they commanded also unto masters that they should use their servants kindly, that they should render unto them what is just and right, and that they should not employ threats, remembering that the God of both is in heaven, and that with him there is no respect of persons."

Bergier says, *Dict. Theol.* Article Esclavage, III., "When our Lord Jesus Christ appeared upon earth, the rights of humanity were not better known than they were in the time of Moses. The philosophers, in place of rendering them more clear, had made them more obscure. The Greeks had decided that amongst men some nations were born for liberty and others for slavery; that everything was lawful against barbarians, that is, against every one that was not a Greek. In the state of Athens alone, there were four hundred thousand slaves for twenty thousand citizens. In Rome the condition of slaves was not better than that of beasts of burden. One shudders at reading the treatment of those unfortunates. (See *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions*, tom. 63, in 12mo., p. 102.) Such was the common law of all nations in the ages of philosophy. If Jesus Christ had by his laws attacked, face to face, this assumed right, he would have given weight to the opposition of the emperors and other sovereigns to the promulgation of the Gospel; and our philosophers of the present day would have accused him for having assailed the public law of all nations."

"The divine legislator did better; he disposed the minds of people, by his maxims of charity, of meekness, of fraternal love between men, to perceive that slavery, in its then character, was getting into opposition to the natural law. It may be perceived by the letter of St. Paul to Philemon, what was the teaching of the Gospel morality on this essential point, and how eloquent was the language of humanity proceeding from the lips of Christian charity. The baptized slave became of right the brother of his master."

The right which Bergier in this place alludes to, as his entire article shows, was not a civil, but a religious right, the right of brotherhood in Christ Jesus, as redeemed by him, and an heir to the same glorious inheritance, as the Apostle St. Paul describes it in his *Epistle to the Galatians*, chapter vii. 26: "For you are all children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. 27. For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. 28. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus. 29. And if you be Christ's, then you are the seed of Abraham; heirs according to the promise."

In the New Testament we find instances of pious and good men having slaves, and in no case do we find the Saviour imputing it to them as a crime, or requiring their servants' emancipation. In chapter viii. of *St. Matthew*, we read of a centurion, who, addressing the Lord Jesus, said, verse 9, "For I also am a man under authority, having soldiers under me; and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth: and to another,

Come, and he cometh: and to my servant, Do this, and he doth it. 10. And Jesus Christ hearing this, wondered, and said to those that followed him, Amen, I say to you, I have not found so great faith in Israel." . . 13. "And Jesus said to the centurion, Go, and as thou hast believed, so be it done to thee. And the servant was healed at the same hour." *St. Luke,* in chapter vii., relates also the testimony which the ancients of Israel gave of this stranger's virtue, and how he loved their nation, and built a synagogue for them.

In many of his parables, the Saviour describes the master and his servants in a variety of ways, without any condemnation or censure of slavery. In *Luke* xvii. he describes the usual mode of acting towards slaves as the very basis upon which he teaches one of the most useful lessons of Christian virtue. Verse 7. "But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say to him, when he is come from the field, immediately, Go sit down. 8. And will not rather say to him, Make ready my supper, and gird thyself, and serve me while I eat and drink, and afterwards thou shalt eat and drink? 9. Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? 10. I think not. So you also, when you shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which we ought to do."

After the promulgation of the Christian religion by the Apostles, the slave was not told by them that he was in a state of unchristian durance. *I Corinthians* vii. 20: "Let every man abide in the same calling in which he is called. 21. Art thou called, being a bondman? Care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. 22. For he that is called in the Lord, being a bondman, is the freeman of the Lord. Likewise he that is called, being free, is the bondman of Christ. 23. You are bought with a price, be not made the bondslaves of men. 24. Brethren, let every man, wherein he was called, therein abide with God." Thus a man by becoming a Christian was not either made free nor told that he was free, but he was advised, if he could lawfully procure his freedom, to prefer it to slavery. The 23d verse has exactly that meaning, which we find expressed also in chapter vi. 20: "For you are bought with a great price; glorify and bear God in your body, which is addressed to the free as well as to the slave: all are the servants of God, and should not be drawn from his service by the devices of men, but should walk worthy of the vocation in which they are called." *Ephesians* iv. 1, and the price by which their souls (not their bodies) were redeemed, is also described by *I St. Peter,* chapter i. 10: "Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible gold or silver from your vain conversation of

the tradition of your fathers." 19. "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled."—That it was a spiritual redemption and a spiritual service, St. Paul again shows, *Hebrew* ix. 14. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Holy Ghost offered himself without spot to God, cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" It is then a spiritual equality, as was before remarked, in the words of St. Paul, *I Corinthians* xii. 13: "For in one spirit we are baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free." And in the same chapter he expatiates to show that though all members of the one mystical body, their places, their duties, their gifts are various and different. And in his *Epistle to the Galatians*, chapter iv., he exhibits the great truth which he desires to inculate by an illustration taken from the institutions of slavery, and without a single expression of their censure.

Nor did the Apostles consider the Christian master obliged to liberate his Christian servant. St. Paul, in his epistle to Philemon, acknowledges the right of the master to the services of his slave, for whom, however, he asks, as a special favour, pardon for having deserted his owner. 10. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my chains. 11. Who was heretofore unprofitable to thee, but now profitable both to thee and to me. 12. Whom I have sent back to thee. And do thou receive him as my own bowels." Thus, a runaway slave still belonged to his master, and though having become a Christian, so far from being thereby liberated from service, he was bound to return thereto and submit himself to his owner. In the same manner that St. Paul sent Onesimus, did the angel send Agar. *Genesis* xvi. 6: "And when Sarai affiicted her, she ran away. 7. And the angel of the Lord having found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, which is in the way to Hur in the desert. 8. He said to her: Agar, handmaid of Sarai, whence comest thou? and whither goest thou? And she answered: I flee from the face of Sarai, my mistress. 9. And the angel of the Lord said to her: Return to thy mistress, and humble thyself under her hand."

St. Paul, indeed, in verse 8, says, "Though I might have much confidence in Christ Jesus to command thee that which is to the purpose." It was the command of friendship, and upon the plea of gratitude, as he exhibits in verse 19: "Not to say to thee that thou owest me thy own self also," because of the conversion and instruction of Philemon by the Apostle,—and the friendship is exhibited in verse 22: "But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I hope through your prayers I shall be given unto you." Still the Apostle felt that even notwithstanding all

those grounds, the right of Philemon subsisted unimpaired. 13. "Whom I would have detained with me, that he might have ministered to me in the bonds of the Gospel. 14. But without thy counsel I would do nothing, that thy good deed might not be as it were of necessity, but voluntary."—It is true that in verse 16 the Apostle requests his manumission, but in verse 18 he exhibits his readiness to pay his ransom, if required. "And if he hath wronged thee in anything, or is in thy debt, put it to my account." And he makes himself legally responsible. 19. "I, Paul, have written with my own hand, I will repay it." Philemon acceded to the request of St. Paul, forgave Onesimus, and sent him to Rome to serve the Apostle, from whom he received his freedom, and was one of the bearers of the letter to the Colossians. (*Col.* iv. 9.)

Again, it is manifest from the Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, that the title of the master continued good to his slave, though both should be Christians, chapter vii.: "Whosoever are servants under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honour, lest the name and doctrine of the Lord be blasphemed. 2. But they who have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but serve them the rather, because they are faithful and beloved, who are partakers of the benefit. These things exhort and teach." And in the subsequent part he declares the contrary teaching to be against the sound words of Jesus Christ, and to spring from ignorant pride.

Slaves are still farther urged by the Apostle to due obedience, in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, vi. 5: "Servants, obey your carnal masters with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as Christ. 6. Not serving to the eye, as it were pleasing men, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. 7. With a good will doing service to the Lord, and not to men. 8. Knowing that whatsoever good every one shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free." And again, in his *Epistle to the Colossians*, chapter iii. 22, "Servants, obey in all things your masters, according to the flesh, not serving with the eye, as pleasing men, but in simplicity of heart, fearing God. 22. Whatever you do, do it from the heart, as to the Lord, and not to men. 24. Knowing that you shall receive of the Lord the reward of inheritance. Serve ye the Lord Jesus Christ. 25. For he that doth an injury, shall receive for that which he hath done unjustly, and there is no respect of persons with God."

The Apostle St. Peter, quite aware of the great temptation to impatience and obstinacy which the misconduct of the master, not seldom, threw in the way of the servant, enters at considerable length and urges the most powerful motives to the Christian slave to induce him by

the example and grace of the Saviour, to be patient. *I Peter* ii. 18: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. 19. For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully. 20. For what glory is it, if sinning and being buffetted you suffer it? But if doing well you suffer patiently, this is thankworthy before God. 21. For unto this you have been called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow his steps. 22. Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. 23. Who when he was reviled did not revile: when he suffered, he threatened not: but delivered himself to him that judged him unjustly. 24. Who himself bore our sins in his own body upon the tree: that we, being dead to sins, should live to justice: by whose stripes you were healed. 25. For you were as sheep going astray; but you are now converted to the pastor and bishop of your souls."

Erasmus says that Cicero never wrote with greater eloquence than St. Paul in the Epistle to Philemon:—And we may both add, that never was there a more touching appeal to worried servants than this address of the prince of the Apostles. Thus each apostle besought one class, recommending mercy and kindness to the master; obedience, fidelity and affection to the slave.

It will now fully establish what will be necessary to perfect the view which I desire to give, if I can show that masters who were Christians were not required to emancipate their slaves, but had pointed out the duties which they were bound as masters to perform, because this will show under the Christian dispensation the legal, moral, and religious existence of slave and master.

The Apostle, as we have previously seen, (*I Tim.* vi. 2,) wrote of slaves who had believing or Christian masters. The inspired penman did not address his instructions and exhortations to masters who were not of the household of faith. *I Corinthians* v. 12: "For what have I to do, to judge them that are without? 13. For them that are without, God will judge; take away the evil one from amongst yourselves." Thus when he addresses masters, they are Christian masters. *Ephesians* vi. 9: "And you, masters, do the same things to them (servants), forbearing threatenings, knowing that the Lord both of them and you is in heaven: and there is no respect of persons with him,"—and again, *Colossians* iv. 1: "Masters, do to your servants that which is just and equal: knowing that you also have a master in heaven."

We have then in the teaching of the Apostles nothing which contradicts the law of Moses, but we have much which corrects the cruelty

of the pagan practice. The exhibition which is presented to us is one of a cheering and of an elevated character. It is true that the state of slavery is continued under the legal sanction, but the slave is taught from the most powerful motives to be faithful, patient, obedient and contented, and the master is taught that though despotism may pass unpunished on earth it will be examined into at the bar of heaven: and though the slave owes him bodily service, yet that the soul of this drudge, having been purchased at the same price as his own, and sanctified by the same laver of regeneration, he who is his slave according to the flesh, is his brother according to the spirit. His humanity, his charity, his affection, are enlisted and interested, and he feels that his own father is also the father of his slave; hence though the servant must readily and cheerfully pay him homage and perform his behest on earth, yet, they may be on an equality in heaven.

How striking, sir, is the contrast between the slave under paganism and the slave under Christianity? The one dreads only him who can kill the body and then has no more power: the other fears him who having slain the body, can cast both body and soul into hell-fire.

The fear of the Lord becomes the safeguard of society, the shield of the owner, and the support of the owned. The example of the Saviour is the best monition to him who governs to do so with tenderness, affection, and charity, blended with wholesome discipline and necessary restraint; whilst to the governed it is the most impressive lesson of resignation to the divine will, the most effectual exhortation to patient obedience, and the best direction to the attainment of lasting peace and high happiness.

The unfortunate pagan saw no prospect beyond the grave of a recompense for humility, for submission, and for obedience. Nor did his master understand the value of a soul, the nature of beatitude, or the merit of mercy: he saw a stern despotism, reckless ambition, and proud and unfeeling oppression deified, and in the treatment of his slaves he emulated his gods; whilst his unfortunate servant crouched before a tyrant whom he hated, and desired the ruin of one from whom he received little kindness.

To the Christian slave was exhibited the humiliation of an incarnate God, the suffering of an unoffending victim, the invitation of this model of perfection to that meekness, that humility, that peaceful spirit, that charity and forgiveness of injuries which constitute the glorious beatitudes. He was shown the advantage of suffering, the reward of patience, and the narrow road along whose rugged ascents he was to bear the cross, walking in the footsteps of his Saviour. The

curtains which divide both worlds were raised as he advanced, and he beheld Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham, whilst the rich man vainly cried to have this once miserable beggar allowed to dip the tip of his finger in water and touch it to his tongue, for he was tormented in that flame.

Thus, sir, did the legislator of Christianity, whilst he admitted the legality of slavery, render the master merciful, and the slave faithful, obedient, and religious, looking for his freedom in that region, where alone true and lasting enjoyment can be found.

I shall proceed, sir, to select a few of the many evidences which the intermediate ages furnish to show the continued legality of domestic slavery, and to exhibit its perfect compatibility with the sound principles of the Christian moral code,—adducing the evidence from the records of that church over which Pope Gregory XVI. so happily presides, and thus conclusively showing that in his apostolic letter he does not condemn it as immoral or illegal; because the Pope is the divinely constituted and authorized witness of the doctrine and morality of the unchanging church, and not a despot who can altar that teaching at his mere will; whilst the church herself claims no power either to add to the deposit of faith, or to change the principles of that morality for whose promulgation she is divinely commissioned.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER V

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 28. 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I have shown that the Saviour did not repeal the permission to hold slaves; but that he promulgated principles calculated to improve their condition, and perhaps, in the process of time, to extinguish slavery. I now proceed to show, from a variety of ecclesiastical documents, that the church which he commissioned to teach all nations, all days to the end of the world, has at all times considered the existence of slaves as compatible with religious profession and practice. Indeed, I might at once conclude, by the general exhibition of the existence of slavery in the midst of Christianity, and the recognition of the right of the Christian master to hold this species of property; but, sir, this is a topic of so much growing importance, that I prefer entering into some detail

to establish the evidence more perfectly by such an exhibition as will remove the last shades of doubt. [32]

I am more perplexed at the difficulty of selecting from the mass that lies before me, than I should be in transcribing at length the immense accumulation itself. I shall then show the canonical legislation of that church during a series of ages, in every region, predicated upon the legal and correctly moral existence of the relation of master and slave.

We have seen already in my fourth letter, that in the canonical epistles of St. Peter and of St. Paul, this relation was recognised and regulated by religious provisions.

The Apostles held several councils, whose acts are not fully recorded in the relation made by St. Luke, and generally known as *Acts of the Apostles*. And a very ancient compilation under the title of "Canons of the Apostles," has been known in the church, and if not the authentic record of their enactments, is admitted to be in conformity with the earliest Christian practice. Amongst these the Canon lxxxi. is the following:

"We do not permit slaves to be raised to clerical rank without the will of their masters, to the injury of their owners. For such conduct produces the upturning of houses. But if, at any time, even a slave may be seen worthy to be raised to that degree, as even our Onesimus was, and the masters shall have granted and given freedom, and have sent them forth from their houses, let it be done."

This is the first of a series of similar enactments, and it should be observed that it recognises the principle of the perfect dominion of the master, the injury to his property, and requires [that] the very legal formality by which the slave was liberated and fully emancipated (sending him forth from the house) should be observed.

The slave had the title, without his owner's consent, to the common rights of religion and the necessary sacraments. In using these no injury was done to the property of his owner; but he had no claim to those privileges of religion by acquiring which a certain rank would be obtained, which would diminish his value to the owner, or would degrade the dignity conferred, and which would impose duties that could not be performed without occupying that time upon which his owner had a claim.

There are eight other books of a remote antiquity, known as *The Constitutions ascribed to the Apostles*, said to be compiled by Pope

[32] The Latin quotations or texts given in the original letters of Bishop England are here omitted.—Ed.

Clement I., who was a companion of the Apostles. It is, however, generally believed that, though Pope Clement might have commenceed such a compilation, he did not leave it in the form which it holds to-day; but, like the *Canons of the Apostles*, the exhibition of discipline is that of the earlier days.

In book iv. chapter 5, enumerating those whose offerings were to be refused by the bishops as unworthy, we have amongst thieves and other sinners.

(*Qui*) *famulos suos dure accipiunt et tractant; id est, verberibus, aut fame afficiunt, aut crudeli servitute premunt.*

"They who receive and treat their slaves harshly; that is, who whip or famish them, or oppress them with heavy drudgery."

There is no crime in having the slave, but cruelty and oppression are criminal.

In the same book, chapter 11, regards slaves and masters:

"What farther, then, can we say of slaves, than that the servant should have benevolence towards his master, with the fear of God, though he should be impious, though wicked, though he should not even agree with him in religion. In like manner, let the master love his slave, and though he is above him, let him judge him to be his equal at least as a human being. But let him who has a Christian master, having regard to his dominion, love him both as a master, as a companion in the faith and as a father not as an eye-servant, but loving his master as one who knows that he will receive the reward of his service to be paid by God. So let the master who has a Christian slave, saving the service, love him as a son and as a brother, on account of the communion of faith."

"Do not command your man-servant nor your woman-servant, having confidence in the same God, in the bitterness of your soul; lest they at any time lament against you, and God be angry with you. And you servants, be subject to your masters, the representatives of God, with care and fear. *As to the Lord and not to men.*"

In the eighth book, chapter 33, is a constitution of SS. Peter and Paul respecting the days that slaves were to be employed in labour, and those on which they were to rest and to attend to religious duties.

Pope Stephen I., who was the 23d Supreme Pontiff, became head of the church in the year 253, and endeavoured, to the best of his ability, to preserve discipline, and, in some letters, to set forth regulations as well as to remedy [various] evils. In Epistle ii., regula iv:

"We also reject those accusers and charges which the secular laws do not receive, and which our predecessors have prohibited."

Soon after he specifies:

"Let not your accuser be a slave or a freed person."

Thus, as well in the ancient discipline of the church during the first two centuries, as in the secular tribunals, the testimony of slaves was inadmissible in many cases.

In the year 305, a provincial council was held at Elvira, in the southern part of Spain. The fifth canon of which is the following:

"If any mistress, carried away by great anger, shall have whipped her maid-servant so that she shall within three days die in torture, as it is uncertain whether it may happen by reason of her will or by accident, it is decreed that she may be admitted to communion, having done lawful penance, after seven years, if it happened by her will; if by accident, after five years. But should she get sick within the time prescribed, she may get communion."

We can perceive by this canon that the Spanish ladies, at that period, which was twenty years before the celebration of the Council of Nice, had not yet so far yielded to the benign influence of the Gospel, and so far restrained their violence of temper as to show due mercy to their female slaves. I doubt much whether the enactment of such a law in our Southern States would not call forth against the legislators more indignation from our ladies than they have ever exhibited against their waiting maids.

The canon lxxx. of the same council, regarded the prohibition of ordaining emancipated slaves or freedom unless their guardians were the clergy or the church.

It may, perhaps, be as well to observe, in this place, a beneficial change which had taken place, not only in public opinion, but even in the court, by reason of the influence of the humanizing spirit of Christianity; so that even the pagan more than once reproved, by his mercy, the professor of a better faith who followed a worse practice.

Theodoret (l. 9, *de Græc.* cur aff.) informs us that Plato established the moral and legal innocence of the master who slew his slave. Ulpian, the celebrated Roman jurist, (1, 2, *de his quae sunt sui vel alieni jur.*) testifies the power which—probably in imitation of the Greeks—the Roman masters had over the lives of their slaves. The well-known sentence of Pollio upon the unfortunate slave that broke a crystal vase at supper, —that he should be cast as food to fish,—and the interference of Augustus, who was a guest at that supper, give a strong exemplification of the tyranny then in many instances indulged. Seneca relates the anecdote in his work de Clement.

Antoninus Pius, as Ulpian relates, issued a constitution about the

year 150, restraining this power, and forbidding a master to put his own slave to death, except in those cases where he would be permitted to slay the slave of another. He further states that the cruelty of the Spaniards to their slaves, especially in the province of Bœtica, in which the city of Elvira was, gave occasion to the constitution; and we have a rescript of Antoninus to Ælius Martianus, the proconsul of Bœtica, in the case of the slave of Julius Sabinus, a Spaniard. In this the right of the masters to their slaves is recognised, but the officer is directed to hear their complaints of cruelty, starvation, and oppressive labour; to protect them, and, if the complaints be founded in truth, not to allow their return to the master; and to insist on the observance of the constitution.

Caius (in l. 2, *ad Cornel. de sicar.*) states that the cause should be proved in presence of judges before the master could pronounce his sentence. Spartianus, the biographer, informs us that the Emperor Adrian, who was the immediate predecessor of Antoninus, enacted a law forbidding masters to kill their slaves, unless legally convicted. And Ulpian relates, near the end of the above quoted work, that Adrian placed, during five years, in confinement (*relegatio*) Umbricia, a lady of noble rank, because, for very slight causes, she treated her female slaves most cruelly. But Constantine the Great, about the year 320, enacted that no master should, under penalty due to homicide, put his slave to death, and gave the jurisdiction to the judges; but if the slave died casually, after necessary chastisement, the master was not accountable to any legal tribunal. (Const. in l. i.; *Code Theod.* de emendat, servorum.)

It will thus be perceived that, as Christianity made progress, the unnatural severity with which this class of human beings was treated became relaxed, and as the civil law ameliorated their condition, the canon law, by its spiritual efficacy, came in with the aid of religion to secure that the followers of the Saviour should give full force to the merciful provisions that were introduced.

It will also be seen that the principle which St. Augustine laid down was that observed, viz., The state was to enact the laws regulating this species of property; the church was to plead for morality and to exhort to practise mercy.

About the same time, St. Peter, Archbishop of Alexandria, in Egypt, drew up a number of penitential canons, pointing out the manner of receiving, treating and reconciling the "lapsed," or those who, through fear of persecution, fell from the profession of the faith. Those canons were held in high repute, and were generally adopted by the eastern bishops. St. Peter succeeded Theonas in that see, in the year

300, and was beheaded by order of the Emperor Maximus, in 311. He ordained Arius deacon, but subsequently excommunicated him for his pride and his obstinacy.

The sixth of those canons exhibits to us a curious device of weak Christians, who desired to escape the trials of martyrdom, without being guilty of actual apostacy. A person of this sort procured, that one of his slaves should personate him, and in his name should apostatize. The canon prescribes for such a slave, who necessarily was a Christian and a slave of a Christian, but one-third of the time required of a free person, in a mitigated penance, taking into account the influence of fear of the master, which, though it did not excuse, yet, it diminished the guilt of the apostacy.

The General Council of Nice, in Bithynia, was held in the year 325, when Constantine was emperor. In the first canon of this council, according to the usual Greek and Latin copies, there is a provision for admitting slaves as well as free persons who have been injured by others, to holy orders. In the Arabic copy, the condition is specially expressed, which is not found in the Greek or Latin, but which had been previously well known and universally established, viz., that this should not take place unless the slave had been manumitted by his master.

About this period, also, several of the Gnostic and Manichean errors prevailed extensively in Asia Minor. The fanatics denied the lawfulness of marriage; they forbid meat to be eaten; they condemned the use of wine; they praised extravagantly the monastic institutions, and proclaimed the obligation on all to enter into religious societies; they decried the lawfulness of slavery; they denounced the slaveholders as violating equally the laws of nature and of religion; they offered to aid slaves to desert their owners; gave them exhortations, invitations, asylum, and protection; and in all things assumed to be more holy, more perfect, and more spiritual than other men.

Osius, Bishop of Cordova, in Spain, whom Pope Sylvester sent as his legate into the East, and who presided in the Council of Nice, was probably present, when, about the period of the Nicene Council, several bishops assembled in the city of Gangræ, in Paphlagonia, to correct those errors. Pope Symmachus declared in a council held in Rome, about the year 500, that Osius confirmed by the authority of the Pope, the acts of this council. The decrees have been admitted into the body of canon law, and have always been regarded as a rule of conduct in the Catholic Church. The third canon is as follows:

"If any one, under the pretence of piety, teaches a slave to despise

his master, and to withdraw from his service, and not to serve his master with good will and all respect. Let him be Anathema."

This last phrase, *Let him be Anathema*, is never appended to any decree which does not contain the expression of unchangeable doctrine respecting belief or morality, and indicates that the doctrine has been revealed by God. It is precisely what St. Paul says in *Galatians* i. 8. "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be Anathema. 9. As we said before to you, so I say now again: If any man preach to you a gospel besides that which you have received; let him be Anathema." It is therefore manifest, that although this Council of Gangræ was a particular one, yet the universal reception of this third canon with its anathema, and its recognition in the Roman Council by Pope Symmachus, gives it the greatest authority, and in Labbe it is further entitled as approved by Leo IV., about the year 850, dist. 20, C. *de libell.*

Several councils were held in Africa, in the third and fourth centuries, especially, in Carthage, in Milevi, and in Hippo. About the year 422, which was the first of Pope Celestine I., one was held under Aurelius, Archbishop of Carthage, and in which St. Augustine sat, as Bishop of Hippo, and legate of Numidia. A compilation was made of the canons of this and the preceding ones which I have mentioned, and this was styled the "African Council." The canon cxvi. of this collection, which has also been taken into the body of the canon law, decrees that slaves shall not be admitted as prosecutors, nor shall certain freedmen be so admitted, except to complain for themselves, and for this as well as for the incapacity of several others there described, the public law is cited as well as the 7th and 8th Councils of Carthage.

The great St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, was born in 329, and died in 379. Amongst his works are his letters, called "Canonical," as they contain a great number of those which were the rules of discipline not only for Asia Minor, but for the vast regions in its vicinity. Mentioning marriages, and writing of several cases in which they are lawful or unlawful, valid or invalid, the fortieth canon regards the marriages of female slaves. In this he mentions a discipline which was not general, but was peculiar to the northeastern provinces of the church, requiring the consent of the master to the validity of the marriage contract of a female slave; this was not required in other places, as is abundantly testified by several documents.

The forty-second canon treats in like manner of the marriages of children without their parents' consent, and generally of those of all slaves without the consent of the owner.

The fifty-third canon regards a female slave who has become a widow.

I shall conclude for this day, but shall follow up the documentary evidence for the legality of holding slaves.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 14, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—In my last, I examined the canonical regulations respecting slavery during the four first centuries of Christianity: during the latter of these, the Christians had the government of the civilized world. At this period the barbarous hordes began to pour extensively their desolating masses over the regions in which Arianism was contending with Catholicity. Had peace been granted immediately after the cessation of pagan persecution, and had the church been able to preserve her dominion over all or the greater number that professed the Christian name, it is probable that the mild spirit of religion would have not only improved the condition of the slaves, but would have dissolved the chains by which many of them were bound.

The Arian succeeded the pagan, and the Goths of various clans soon were found dismembering the ancient empire of the Romans. The Circumcellions of Africa had scarcely disappeared before the Visigoths, when the untamed Attila, with his wild Huns, sweeping along the Danube and the Rhine, carried desolation into Gaul, and disturbed the followers of Pharamond, and the Goths, who had lately established themselves in many of the strongholds of the ancient Gauls and more modern Romans. His career was arrested on the banks of the Rhone, as he was rushing towards the Mediterranean. Returning to Pannonia, he recruited his force, and directed his march towards Italy. Aquileia still exhibits, after fourteen centuries, as distinct a monument of the barbarity of the Huns, as Mount Benedict does, after six years, of the ruthless and unmanly bigotry of the Bostonians. History attests the extraordinary manner in which, flushed with victory and ambitious of spoils, he at the monition and request of Pope St. Leo I., turned the tide of his host, and withdrew to his fastnesses beyond the Danube. The captives made on both sides in these desolating incursions, increased the number of slaves, which from other causes had been greatly reduced.

As early as the days of St. Polycarp and St. Ignatius, who were disciples of the Apostles, Christians had, from motives of mercy, charity, and affection, manumitted many of their slaves in the presence of the bishops, and this was more or less extensively practised through the succeeding period. In several particular churches, it was agreed that if a slave became a Christian, he should be manumitted on receiving baptism. In Rome, the slave was frequently manumitted by the form called *Vindicta*, with the prætor's rod. Constantine, in the year 317, as Sozomen relates, (lib. 1, c. 9,) transferred this authority to the bishops, who were empowered to use the rod in the church, and have the manumission testified in the presence of the congregation. A rescript of that emperor to this effect is found in the *Theodosian Code*, l. 1, c. *de his qui in Eccl. manumitt.* The master, who consented to manumit the slave, presented him to the bishop, in presence of the congregation, and the bishop pronounced him free and became the guardian of his freedom. The rescript was directed to Prottogenas, Bishop of Sardica, and was in the consulship of Sabinus and Ruffinus.

In book 2, of the same code, is a rescript to Osius, Bishop of Cordova, in which the emperor empowers the bishops to grant the privilege of Roman citizenship to such freedmen as they may judge worthy.

In the consulship of Crispus and Constantine, a grant was given to the clergy of manumitting their own slaves when they pleased, by any form they should think proper. About a century later, St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, informs us (*Sermo, de diversis,* 50) that this form was established in Africa. "The deacon of Hippo, is a poor man; he has nothing to give to any person; but, before he was a clergyman, he, by the fruit of his labour and industry, bought some little servants, and is to-day, by the episcopal act, about to manumit them in your sight."

This same holy bishop writes, (*Enarrat in Psal.* cxxiv.,) "Christ does not wish to make you proud whilst you walk in this journey, that is, whilst you are in this life. Has it happened that you have been made a Christian, and you have a man as your master: you have not been made a Christian that you may scorn to serve. When, therefore, by the command of Christ you are the servant of a man, your service is not to him, but to the one that gave you the command to serve. And he says: Hear your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, and in the simplicity of your hearts, not as eye-servants, as if pleasing men, but, as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God, from your hearts, with a good will. Behold, he did not liberate you from being servants, but he made those who were bad servants to be good servants.

O, how much do the rich owe to Christ who has thus set order in their houses! So, if there be in his family a faithless slave, and Christ convert him, he does not say to him, "Leave your master, because you have now known him who is the true master! Perhaps this master of yours is impious and unjust, and that you are faithful and just, it is unbecoming that the just and faithful should serve the unjust and the infidel; this is not what he said; but, let him rather serve." This great Doctor of the Church continues then at considerable length to show how Christ, by his own example, exhorts the servants to fidelity and obedience to their masters in everything, save what is contrary to God's service. Subsequently, he passes to the end of time, and the opening of eternity, and shows many good, obedient and afflicted servants mingled with good masters among the elect, and bad, faithless, and stubborn servants, with cruel masters, cast among the reprobates.

In his book i., on the sermon of Christ on the mountain, he dwells upon the duty of Christian masters to their slaves. They are not to regard them as mere property, but to treat them as human beings having immortal souls, for which Christ died.

Thus, we perceive that though from the encouragement of manumission and the spirit of Christianity, the number of slaves had been greatly reduced and their situation greatly improved, still, the principles were recognised, of the moral and religious legality of holding slave property, and of requiring that they should perform a reasonable service.

We have next to consider a canon enacted by that same Leo the Great, who caused "the scourge of God," Attila, to spare Italy. Indeed, it is rather the repressing of an abuse, by enforcing an ancient canon. It is found the first of five which he promulgated to the bishops of Campania and the Picene territory, in the year 445. The instances of voluntary slavery, such as that related of St. Paulinus of Nola, in Campania, were not very rare. It is related by St. Gregory, that having bestowed all that he could raise, to ransom prisoners taken by the barbarians who overran the country, upon the application of a poor widow whose son was held in captivity, he sold himself, to procure the means of her son's release. His good conduct procured the affection of his master, and subsequently his emancipation. Thus slavery lost some of its degrading character. This, together with the confusion arising from the turbulence accompanying the invasions, caused a relaxation of discipline: to remedy some of the abuses, Pope Leo issued several letters. The following is an extract from the first of them: it has been taken into the body of the canon law. Dist. 5, Admittuntur:—

"Persons who have not the qualifications of birth or conduct, are everywhere admitted to holy orders; and they who could not procure freedom from their masters are elevated to the rank of the priesthood; as if the lowliness of slavery could rightfully claim this honour: and, as if he who could not procure the approbation of even his master, could procure that of God. There is, therefore, in this a double criminality: for the holy ministry is polluted by the meanness of this fellowship, and so far as regards the rashness of this unlawful usurpation, the rights of the masters are infringed. Wherefore, dearest brethren, let all the priests of your province keep aloof from these: and not only from these, but also, we desire they should abstain from those who are under bond, by origin or any condition, except perchance upon the petition or consent of the persons who have them in their power in any way. For he who is to be aggregated to the divine warfare, ought to be exempt from other obligations: so that he may not by any bond of necessity be drawn away from that camp of the Lord for which his name has been enrolled."

Prosper, liber. 2, *De Vitâ Contemplat.* Caput 3, and many other writers of this century, treat of the relative duties of the Christian master and his Christian slave. The zeal and charity of several holy men led them to make extraordinary sacrifices also, during this period, to redeem the captives from the barbarians: besides the remarkable instance of St. Paulinus, we have the ardent and persevering charity of St. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, who sold the plate belonging to the church, and used glass for the chalice, that he might be able by every species of economy to procure liberty for the enslaved.

The right of the master, the duty of the slave, the lawfulness of continuing the relation, and the benevolence of religion, in mitigating the sufferings of those in bondage and releasing them by lawful means permitted by the state, are the results exhibited by our view of the laws and facts during the first four centuries of Christianity.

It is proper here also to notice, that amongst several of those barbarians, especially after they embraced the Christian religion, slavery began to assume a variety of mitigated forms, which will be in some degree developed as we proceed with the history of canonical legislation.

About the year 494, Pope Gelasius, issued a constitution, in which he mentions, amongst other monitions given to a bishop at his ordination: "That he should never presume to hold unlawful ordination; that he should not allow to holy orders, ... any person bound to the service of the court, or liable to bond from his condition (slavery) or marked thereto.

In the year 506, which was the 22d year of Alaric's reign, and the

8th of Pope Symmachus, a council was held at Agdle, in France, in the present department of Herault, which was then under the dominion of the Visigoths who had subjugated Spain, the sixty-second canon of which is the following:

"If any one shall put his own servant to death, without the knowledge of the judge, let him make compensation for the guilt of blood by excommunication or two years' penance."

Another council was held eleven years later, in the fourth year of Pope Hormisdas and the 6th of King Childibert, to whom Clovis had given a part of his territory after he had slain Alaric in battle. This council was held at Epao or Epanum, which was near the Rhone, it is supposed not far from lake Leman, near Geneva. At this period it was usual to hold ecclesiastical assemblies at a distance from the distraction of the cities, and removed from the influence of petty tyrants, generally in some large country residence. Many of the canons of this Synod of Epao are little more than transcripts of those of Agdle. The 34th, is—

"If any one shall slay his own servant without the knowledge of the judge, let him expiate the shedding of blood by an excommunication of two years."

Thus we find that at this period, nearly two hundred years after the law of Constantine forbidding this exercise of power by the master, the practice existed under the Goth, the Gauls and the Franks. Several authors however interpret these enactments as regarding manslaughter or unintentional slaying, because it is generally believed, that at all times the period was seven years for voluntary homicide.

Several councils were held in the city of Orleans, in the department of Loiret, in France. The third Council of Orleans was held in the year 538, the second of Pope Silverius, and 27th of Childebert, king of the Franks.

The thirteenth canon regulates, that if Christian slaves shall be possessed by Jews, and these latter require them to do anything forbidden by the Christian religion, or if the Jews shall seize upon any of their servants to whip or punish them for those things that have been declared to be excusable or forgiven, and those slaves fly to the church for protection, they are not to be given up, unless there be given and received a just and sufficient sum to warrant their protection.

The canon xxvi. gives us a specimen of the early feudalism nearly similar to the subsequent villain service:

"Let no one held under servile or colonizing conditions be admitted to church honours, in violation of the statutes of the Apostolic See; un-

less it be evident that he has been previously absolved therefrom by will or by deed. And if any bishop being aware of such condition of the person so ordained, shall wilfully transgress by making such unlawful ordination, let him not presume to celebrate mass for the space of a year."

The colonial condition was in its origin different from the mere servile. The *mancipium* or *manu captum* was the servus or slave made in war: the *colonus*, or husbandman, though at the period at which we are arrived, frequently he was in as abject a condition, yet was so by a different process. St. Augustine, in caput. i. liber. x., *De Civitate Dei*, tells us, *Coloni dicuntur, qui conditionem debebant genitali solo propter agriculturam sub dominio possessorum.* "They are called colonists who owe their condition to their native land, under the dominion of its possessors."

The following history of various modes by which they became servants, is taken from the work *De Gubernat. Dei.* liber. 5, by the good and erudite Salvianus, a priest, who died at Marseilles, about the year 484:

"Some of those when they lose their dwellings and their little fields by invasion, or leave them, being worried by exactions, as they can no longer hold them, seek the grounds of the larger proprietors, and become the colonists of the wealthy. Or, as is usual with those who are driven off by the fear of enemies, take refuge in the castles, or who, having lost their state of safe freedom fly to some asylum in despair: so they who can no longer have the place or the dignity derived from their birth, subject themselves to the abject yoke of the sojourner's lot; reduced to such necessity, that they are stripped not only of their property but also of their rank, going into exile not only from what belongs to them, but from their very selves, and with themselves losing all that they had, they are bereft of any property in things, and lose the very right of liberty. . . . A more degrading injury is added to this evil. For they are received as strangers, they become inhabitants bereft of the rights of inhabitants, they who receive them as foreigners and aliens begin to treat them as property, and change into slaves those who, evidently, were free."

We are not, sir, without a large host of our *Native American Society*, who enter very fully into the views of the hospitable proprietors whom Salvian describes.

In this picture of the colonists, we may find the outline of the villain of a later age; and in the several enactments and regulations of succeeding legislators and councils, we shall discover the changes which the fea-

tures of servitude underwent, previous to its nearly total extinction in Europe.

Flodoardin, chapter 28, of *History of the Church of Rheims*, gives us the will of St. Remi, its bishop, who baptized Clovis, upon his conversion in 496, and who was still living in the year 550. This document grants freedom to some of the colonists belonging to that church and retains others in service. Critics are divided in opinion as to the document being a correct copy; but it shows, at all events, that at this period the church did not consider it criminal to hold such property.

Du Cange says (Art. Colonus), that though in several instances the condition of the colonists was as abject as that of slaves, yet generally they were in a better position. *Erant igitur coloni mediæ conditionis inter ingenuos seu liberos et servos.*

Very urgent duties will prevent my resuming this historical exhibition for two or three weeks. Meantime, sir, I have the honour to be, respectfully, and so forth.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 9, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I have exhibited an outline of ecclesiastical legislation respecting slaves during more than five centuries of the early period of the Christian church. I remarked that a variety of circumstances gave new modifications to slavery, and I exhibited one or two instances, of that change in the class of colonists. It will be necessary for me, before proceeding farther, to remark at greater length upon the nature of that variety, in order to understand better the canons which in many instances are found in the subsequent enactments.

When so erudite an antiquarian as Muratori, treating of the Roman slaves and freedmen, acknowledges that he is unable accurately to state the conditions on which they manumitted their slaves, it would be folly for me to undertake the task. In his treatise *Sopra I Servie, Liberti Antichi*, he has a passage which I thus translate:

"We know not whether they manumitted upon condition, or, if so, upon what conditions they manumitted formerly those servants who continued thenceforth as freed persons, but elevated to more honourable employments, to serve in the houses of their masters. We do, indeed, know in the Tit. *de Operis Libertorum*, and in another *de bonis Libertorum* of the *Digests*, that very many acquired their liberty with the

obligation of giving to their masters presents, or doing work if they were artists, *Operas vel donum.* This was in all likelihood practised only by merchants or other masters given to making profit, but not by noble houses. As to these the ancient inscriptions exhibit to us that very many who obtained their freedom, yet continued to live and to do service in those same houses, no longer as slaves but as freed persons, because probably each party found it beneficial. The patrons kept about them persons in whom they had confidence and who had already been engrafted on their families; the freed persons grown to honour and making profit, could create property for themselves and for their children. I cannot discover whether the Romans had hireling servants as is now the case. They then had true slaves and sometimes freed persons. This being the case, it is matter of surprise that Pignoria, in treating of the employment of the ancient slaves, should have been so perplexed as not to be able clearly to distinguish slaves from freed persons, and should have attributed to the former many employments which were specially reserved for the latter: and it is more to be wondered at, that marbles which speak of freed persons are referred to by him and explained as treating of slaves."

Noi non sappiamo se cun patti, e con quai patti una vulta si manomet-tessero que' Servi, che poi continuavano come Liberti a servire in Casa de'loro Padroni, con essere alzati a pin onorati impieghi...Sappiamo bensi dal Tit. ne Operis Libertorum, e dall' altro de bonis Libertorum ne' Digesti, che moltissimi acquistavane la Liberta con obbligarsi di fare ai Padroni de' Regaii, o delle Fatture, se erano Artefici, Operas vel Donum. *Questo si praticava verisimilmente dai soli Mercatanti, ed altri Signori dati all' interasse, mo non gia dalle Nobili Case. Per conto di questo, le antiche Iscrizioni ci fanno vedere, che moltissimi furono coloro, che anche dopo la conseguita Liberta seguitavano a convivere, e servire in quelle medesime Case, non piu come Servi, ma come Liberti, perche probabilmente tornava il conto agli uni, e agli altri. I Padroni si servivano di Persone loro confidenti, e gia innestate nella propria Famiglia; ei Liberti cresciuti di onore, e di guadagno poteano ceumulara roba per se, e per li Figli. Non ho io potuto scoprire se i Romani tenessero Servi Mercenarj come oggidi. O di veri Servi, o di Liberti allora si servivano. Cio posto, maraviglia e, che il Pignoria in trattando degli Ufizj de' Servi antichi, imbrogliasse tanto le carte, senza distinguere i Servi dai Liberti, e con attribuir molti impieghi ai primi, che pure erano riserbati agli ultimi. E piu da stupire e, citarsi da lui Marmi, che parlano di Liberti, e pure sono presi da esso, come se parlassero di Servi.*

Thus it is clear that even in the days of the Emperor Claudius, to

whose reign, A. D. 45, the marble of which he treats refers, and probably long before that period, many of the freedmen of the Roman empire were bound to do certain services for the patrons who had been their masters, and that this obligation descended to their progeny. Hence this would still be a species of servitude.

The barbarians who overran the empire came chiefly from Scythia and from Germany, as that vast region was then called, which stretches from the Alps to the Northern Ocean. And when they settled in the conquered provinces of Gaul and in Italy itself, they introduced many of their customs and principles as well of government as of policy. Most of their slaves were what the writers of the second, third, and fourth centuries describe as *coloni* and *conditionibus obligati*. As Tacitus describes in xxv. *De Moribus Germanorum*, of which the following is Murphy's translation:—

"The slaves in general are not arranged at their several employments in the household affairs, as is the practice at Rome. Each has his separate habitation, and his own establishment to manage. The master considers him as an agrarian dependent, who is obliged to furnish a certain quantity of grain, of cattle, or of wearing apparel. The slave obeys, and the state of servitude extends no further. All domestic affairs are managed by the master's wife and children. To punish a slave with stripes, to load him with chains, or condemn him to hard labour, is unusual. It is true, that slaves are sometimes put to death, not under colour of justice, or of any authority vested in the master; but in a transport of passion, in a fit of rage, as is often the case in a sudden affray; but it is also true, that this species of homicide passes with impunity. The freedmen are not of much higher consideration than the actual slaves; they obtain no rank in their master's family, and if we except the parts of Germany where monarchy is established, they never figure on the stage of public business. In despotic governments they rise above the men of ingenuous birth, and even eclipse the whole body of the nobles. In other states the subordination of the freedmen is a proof of public liberty."

In the appendix to the *Theodosian Code*, Const. 5, we read:

"It is forbidden as a shameless trick; that an effort should be made to regain to their condition or original state, those whom the master or patron could not aid when in a period of famine they were pressed nearly to death by want."

This exhibits the obligation on the patron of the person under condition, and on the master of the slave to support them, and the destruction of their title by the neglect of their duty.

Du Cange calls this "condition" *obnoxitatio*, which we may perhaps translate "liability," *tributum*, "a tribute," *pensitatio*, which is generally considered to be "a yearly payment."

It will then suffice for my present purpose to have shown, that at this period of the sixth century, there existed unconditional slavery, and a conditional servitude, or that of persons bound either for freedom received, or for other cause, to render personal service or tribute in kind or yearly pension in payment in coin, as also colonists, some of whom were absolute slaves, but attached to the land upon which they wrought, and who owed their whole service to their owners, and other colonists who had the produce of the land, but were bound thereto and obliged to pay certain portions of that produce to the proprietor, but were in all other respects free to act as they thought proper, and to use the fruits of the soil as they thought proper.

Muratori justly observes, that in process of time, the special agreements and particular enactments regarding the *conditions*, gave such a variety as baffled all attempts at classification and precision.

At a much earlier period, slaves had become a drug in the Italian market. When about the year 405, Rhadagasius, the Goth, was leading upwards of three hundred thousand of his barbarians into Italy, the Emperor Honorius ordered the slaves to be armed for the defence of the country, by which arming they generally obtained their freedom: Stilichon, the consul, slew nearly 150,000 of the invaders in the vicinity of Florence, and made prisoners of the remainder, who were sold as slaves at the low price of one piece of gold for each. Numbers of them died within the year, so that Baronius relates, (*Annals*, A. D. 406,) that the purchasers had to pay more for their burial than for their bodies; according to the remarks of Orosius. In this state of the market, it was easy for the slave to procure that he should be held *at a condition*, and thenceforth the number under condition greatly increased, and in process of time, became more numerous than those in absolute slavery.

This hasty and imperfect view will elucidate much of the phraseology of our legislation. I now proceed to exhibit the action of the councils respecting slavery. In the year 541, some dates would make it appear 545, the fourth Council of Orange was celebrated, in the xxth year of King Childebert. The following is its ninth canon:—

"Be it enacted, That a bishop who has left none of his private property to the church, shall not dispose of any of the church property, otherwise than as the canons point out. Should he bind, or sell, or separate anything otherwise, let it be recalled for the church. But if, indeed, he has made freedmen of slaves of the church, to a reasonable number, let

them continue in their freedom, but with the obligation of not departing from the duty of the church."

The Canon xxiii. of the same council is—

"That it be not lawful for the slaves of the church, or of the priests, to go on predatory excursions or to make captives, for it is unjust that when the masters are accustomed to aid in redeeming, the discipline of the church should be disgraced by the misconduct of the slaves."

The canon in prohibiting the abuse, not only shows the existence of slavery, but that it was not considered criminal in the church as a corporation, or in the clergyman as an individual, to hold such property. Many of our modern infidel writers, generally styled liberal, have copied and enlarged upon and adduced also as irrefragable witnesses, ancient writers inimical to the church, who have described the incursions of these slaves and dependants in this and subsequent ages; connecting their misdeeds with the church, describing them as instigated by prelates and by priests to commit robberies for the benefit of religion, and concealing studiously from view the efforts made by churchmen, not only to restrain their wickedness, but to protect their victims, and never alluding to the sacrifices made by the clergy to compensate the sufferers.

But that these were not the only abuses, against which the church had to contend in those disastrous times, the next canon will exhibit. In Judaism, God had established a limited sanctuary for slaves and for certain malefactors, not to encourage crime, but to protect against the fury of passion, and to give some sort of aid to the feeble. Paganism adopted the principle, and the Christian temple and its precincts, became not only by common consent, but by legal enactment the sanctuary instead of the former. Like every useful institution, this too was occasionally abused. The xxixth canon was—

"Let not those slaves who, under pretext of marriage, take refuge within the precincts of the church, imagining that by this they would make a marriage, be allowed to do so, nor let such union be countenanced by the clergy: for it has been regulated that they who form a union, without lawful delivery, should be, for the good order of religion, separated for a fixed period from the communion of the church, so that this vile connexion may be prevented in holy places. Wherefore we decree, that such persons being declared free from the bond of any plighted faith, and made to promise a separation, should be restored to their parents or owners as the case may require; to be, however, subsequently, if the parents or owners should grant leave, married with their own free consent."

Thus it would appear, that as we have seen in some parts of the

East at an earlier period, now in this portion of the West, the slaves were made incapable of entering into the marriage contract without the owner's consent. This discipline we shall however see, was at a subsequent period very properly abolished: for marriage is one of those natural rights which is not conveyed away by the subjection of the slave.

In this same council, canon xxx., provision is made for affording to the Christians, who are held as slaves by the Jews, not only sanctuary of the church, but in the house of any Christian, until a fair price shall be stipulated for and paid to the Jewish owner, if the Christian be unwilling to return to his service. This is a clear recognisation of the right of property in slaves.

Canon xxxi. of this council provides, that if any Jew shall bring a slave to be proselyte to his religion, or make a Jew of a Christian slave, or take as his companion a Christian female slave, or induce a slave born of Christian parents to became a Jew under the influence of a promise of emancipation, he shall lose the title to every such slave. And further, that if any Christian slave shall become a Jew for the sake of being manumitted *with condition*, and shall continue to be a Jew, the liberty shall be lost, and *the condition* shall not avail him.

Canon xxxii. provides that the descendants of a slave, wherever they may be, even after a long lapse of time, though there should be neglect, if found upon the land or possession upon which their parents were placed, shall be held to the original conditions established by the deceased proprietor for the deceased parents, and the priest of the place shall aid in enforcing the fulfilment, and any persons, who shall through avarice interpose obstacles, shall be placed under church censures.

The doctrine and discipline of the church of the Franks was like that of other churches in the several regions of Christendom at this period.

A fifth council was held at Orleans, after the death of King Theobert, in the year 549, which was the tenth of Pope Vigilius, and the thirty-eighth of King Childebert. The sixth canon of this council relates to the improper ordination of slaves, to which I have previously adverted, and also exhibits to us more distinctly the freedmen *under condition*, classing them in this regard to a certain extent in the same category with slaves.

We also find here reference to a much more ancient canonical regulation, which I do not recollect to have seen elsewhere, punishing the bishop at the will of the owner, for his improper interference with that owner's property, in the slave that he ordained.

Canon vi. "That no bishop shall dare to ordain as a clergyman,

the slave who shall not have received license from his proper owners; or a person already freed, without the permission of either the person whose servant he is, or of the person who is known to have freed him. And if any one shall do so, let him who is ordained be recalled by his master, and let him who conferred the order, if it be proved that he did so knowing the state of the person, not presume to celebrate mass for six months only. [33] But if it be proved that he is the servant of lay persons, let the person ordained be kept in his rank and do service for his owner in a way becoming his order; but if his lay owner debases him under that grade, so as to do any dishonour to his holy order, let the bishop who ordained him give, as the ancient canons enact, two slaves to his master, and be empowered to take him whom he ordained to his church."

The next canon regards manumission, and the protection of those properly liberated from slavery, against the overbearing and injustice of persons who disregarded the legal absolution from service, given even with their own consent, by the authority of the civil government, in the church by the bishop. It more frequently happened that the liberation was made by one and the dragging back to slavery was the act of the heir.

Canon xii. "And since we have discovered by information from several, that they who according to the custom of the country were absolved from slavery in the churches, were again at the will of some persons, reduced to slavery; we have regarded it to be an impiety; that what has by a judicial decree [34] been absolved from servitude in the church of God, should be set at naught. Wherefore, through motives of piety, it is decreed by common counsel to be henceforth observed; that whatever slaves are freed from servitude by free masters, are to remain in that freedom which they then received from the masters, and should this liberty of theirs be assailed by any person, it shall be defended within the limits of justice by the churches, saving where there are crimes for which the laws have enacted that the liberty granted to servants shall be recalled."

From the above it would appear that the persons then called *liberti*, or freedmen, or the *conditionati* or persons under condition, and probably in some instances, *coloni* or colonists, had slaves, but were not permitted to liberate them, at least without the consent of their own masters, for the canon speaks of only the servants of the *ingenui* or those who enjoyed

[33] Canon xxvi. of the first Council of Orange made the suspension "a year," this, "six months only."

[34] Consideratione, "By a judicial decree," Du Cange, *Decretum*, Judicium curiae.

perfect freedom. We see, also, what is evident from many other sources, that persons who had obtained their freedom, were for some crimes reduced to servitude, and we shall see in future times, even freedmen so enslaved for various offences.

Again, in the canon xxii., of this same council, we find provision which exhibits the caution which was used in regulating the right of sanctuary for slaves. This right was, in Christianity, a concession of the civil power, humanely interposing, in times of imperfect security and violent passion, the protecting arm of the church, to arrest the violence of one party so as to secure merciful justice for the other, and to make the compositions of peace and equity be substituted for the vengeance or the exactions of power. It was, so far from being an encouragement to crime, one of the best helps towards civilizing the barbarian.

Canon xxii. "We enact this to be observed respecting slaves, who may for any fault fly to the precincts of the church, that as is found written in ancient constitutions, when the master shall pledge his oath to grant pardon to the culprit, whosoever he may be, he shall go out secure of pardon. But, if the master, unmindful of his oath, shall be convicted of having gone beyond what he had sworn, so that it shall be proved that the servant who had received pardon was afterwards tortured with any punishment for that fault, let that master who was forgetful of his oath, be separated from the communion of all. Again, should the servant secured from punishment by the master's oath, be unwilling to go forth, it shall be lawful for the master, that he should not lose the service of a slave seeking sanctuary by such contumacy, to seize upon such a one unwilling to go out, so that the church should not suffer either trouble or calumny by any means on account of retaining such servant: but, let not the master in any way rashly violate the oath that he swore for granting pardon. But, if the master be a gentile, or of any other sect proved without the church, let the person who claims the slave procure Christian persons of good account who shall swear for the servant's security in the master's name: because they who dread ecclesiastical discipline for transgression can keep that which is sacred."

About this period a council was held at the ancient capital of the Averni, subsequently Auvergne in France; the city was in after times called "Clarus Mons"—now "Clermont," in *Puy de Dome*. The sixth canon of this Conic. II., Avernens, is the same in substance and nearly a literal copy of the xxii. of Orleans. Aurel. V., enacting the like penalty of six months' suspension from celebrating Mass, against the bishop who in certain cases should ordain a slave.

Thus we find the property in slaves fully recognised by the church in the sixth century.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 17, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I shall, for a moment, extend my observations to the most western part of Europe known at the period of which I treat, and to a date about one hundred and fifty years prior to that, at which we have arrived.

My object in doing so, is to show, as fully as the evidence within my reach will admit, that the state of those countries, whose ecclesiastical legislation I have produced, differed not, respecting slavery, from the other regions of Europe. The act, to which I am about to refer, is one of those violations of all law and order, of which no one can approve, but a reference to which is absolutely necessary, to understand the history that must be unfolded at a future period of our inquiry.

The Irish had slaves, as all the other nations had, and about the year 402, Neill Naoigiallach, or Niel of the Nine Hostages, having ravaged the coast of Britain and Gaul, was slain, in 403, near the Portus Iccius, supposed to be in the vicinity of Boulogne. In this expedition, a large number of captives were made, of whom it is stated, that two hundred were young men of very respectable families: one youth, of only sixteen years of age, by the name of Cothraige, was sold to Milcho, and was employed by him in tending sheep, in a place called Dalradia—within the present county of Antrim. After three years he was delivered, and returned to Gaul, where, some years subsequently, he was reduced again to captivity, probably by a band of roving Franks, but was released after a couple of months. This Cothraige was St. Patrick, subsequently the Apostle of Ireland.

St. Patrick, in his confession, states that many of his unfortunate countrymen were carried off and made captives, and dispersed among many nations.

The Romans had possession of Britain, and even had not slavery existed there previously, they would have introduced it; but, unfortunately, the Britons needed not this lesson; they had been abundantly conversant

with it before; and we shall see evidence of the long continuance of its practice.

About the year 450, a party of them, amongst whom were several that professed the Christian religion, made a piratical incursion upon the Irish coast, under the command of Corotic, or Caractacus, which is also sometimes called Coroticus, and which seems to have been in Britain, for a long period, as regular a monarchic appellation as was Pharaoh in Egypt. Of this incursion, Lanigan compiles the following account, from several authors, to whom he refers, and from whom he quotes in his notes: [35]

"This prince, Coroticus, though apparently a Christian, was a tyrant, a pirate, and a persecutor. He landed with a party of his armed followers, many of whom were Christians, at a season of solemn baptism, and set about plundering a district (undoubtedly maritime) in which St. Patrick had just baptized and confirmed a great number of converts, and on the very day after the holy chrism was seen shining in the foreheads of the white-robed neophytes. Having murdered several persons, these marauders carried off a considerable number of people, whom they went about selling or giving up as slaves to the Scots and the apostate Picts. St. Patrick wrote a letter, not extant, which he sent by a holy priest whom he had instructed from his younger days, to those pirates, requesting of them to restore the baptized captives and some part of the booty. The priest and the other ecclesiastics, that accompanied him, being received by them with scorn and mockery, and the letter not attended to, the saint found himself under the necessity of issuing a circular epistle or declaration against them and their chief Coroticus, in which announcing himself a bishop and established in Ireland, he proclaims to all those who fear God, that said murderers and robbers are excommunicated and estranged from Christ, and that it is not lawful to show them civility, nor to eat or drink with them, nor to receive their offerings, until sincerely repenting they make atonement to God and liberate his servants and the handmaids of Christ. He begs of the faithful, into whose hands the epistle may come, to get it read before the people everywhere, and before Coroticus himself, and to communicate it to his soldiers, in the hope that they and their master may return to God, and so forth. Among other very affecting expostulations, he observes, that the Roman and Gallic Christians are wont to send proper persons with great sums of money to the Franks and other pagans, for the purpose of redeeming Christian captives; while, on the contrary, that mon-

[35] *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland,* vol. i., chap. iv. § x.

ster, Coroticus, made a trade of selling the members of Christ to nations ignorant of God."

The Britons were frequently invaded by the Scots, upon the abandonment of their country by the Romans; and at that period here alluded to, it is supposed by many, that the captives taken from Ireland were, in several instances, given by their possessors to the plundering and victorious Northmen, by the Britons, in exchange for their own captured relatives whom they desired to release.

Here, sir, we have an instance which will show us the nature of that traffic in slaves, which the letter of his Holiness Pope Gregory XVI. condemns, and which was condemned by the legate of Pope Leo the Great, in Ireland, nearly fourteen centuries ago, about the very period when Leo himself turned the fierce Hun Attila, "the scourge of God," from the devastation of Italy; and it was somewhat about this period, that the harassed Britons called, through Vortigern, upon the Saxon Hengist and Horsa, to protect them from their ferocious neighbours on the North. This, sir, will suffice to show us, that not a spot in the then known regions of the globe, could be pointed out, that was exempt from the prevalence of slavery.

I now return to examine the history of ecclesiastical legislation on this subject, during the period subsequent to my last notice. I shall, however, supply an omission that I made in the proceedings of the Council of Clermont, as given in my last, viz., that the seventh canon adopted the principle and enacted the regulations of the 24th canon of the fourth Council of Orleans, respecting the duty of the bishop to defend the freedom of those who were manumitted. I have also to correct some mistakes of name in that letter, where I gave the appellation of Orange to Orleans, and did not observe it until too late for correction.

About the year 555, which was the third of Pope Pelagius I., and forty-sixth of King Childebert, the third Council of Paris was celebrated. In this we find a canon which is styled *De servis degeneribus*, which, in the phraseology of that age, means *bastard servants.*—See Du Cange.

Canon IX. "It is enacted concerning bastard slaves who are placed to keep the sepulchres, because of the rank of that office, that whether they be placed under the protection of the heirs or of the church for their defence, upon the condition upon which they were discharged by their owners, the will of the deceased should be observed in all things in their regard. But, if the church shall keep them entirely exempt from the services and payments of the fisc, let them and their descendants

enjoy the protection of the church for defence and pay to it their tribute. [36]

The *Auctores* or authors, in the original sense, was *owners* or *masters*; and subsequently, especially in Gaul, it was often taken to mean *parents*, which probably from the context, is here its meaning; and we find a new title and a new class, where the master having committed a crime with his servant, the offspring was his slave; yet, his natural affection caused the parent to grant him a conditioned freedom, to protect which this canon specified the guardian to be either the heir or the church.

In or about the year 610, or in the second year of King Ariamia, the second Council of Alicant, in the province of Valentia, in Spain, was celebrated: it is styled Lucense II. It received and adopted the *Capitula* or heads of canons sent to a previous council, Lucense I. or first of Alicant, which was celebrated in the year 607, in the reign of Theodomir, father of Ariamir. These little chapters or heads were transmitted by Martin, archbishop or metropolitan of Braga, who presided at the third council of that city, in the year 572.

Martin collected from the councils of the east and the west, the greater portion of the canon law then in force and made a compendium thereof, which he distributed into 84 heads, which formed as many short canons, and thenceforth they were the basis of the discipline in Spain.

The forty-sixth of these canons is the following:

"If any one is bound to servile tribute, or by any condition, or by the patronage of any house, he is not to be ordained a clergyman, unless he be of aproved life and the consent of the patron be also given."

This canon is taken into the body of the canon law. *Dist.* 53.

Canon xlvii. "If any person will teach the servant of another under pretext of religion to despise his master and to withdraw from his service, let him be most sharply rebuked by all."

This too is taken into the body of the canon law. (17. q. 4, Si quis.) I before observed that this was one of the earliest enactments at Ancyra, in the eastern division of the church, against the fanatics of the third and fourth centuries. Their spirit seems to have transmigrated to our continent, and to have animated several of our overseeming pious folk of the present day.

In the year 589 the third Council of Toledo, in Spain, was celebrated, in the pontificate of Pope Pelagius II. All the bishops of Spain assembled upon the invitation of King Reccared, and the Goths, after

[36] *Occursum,* in the style of that age and country, is *tribute* or *payment.*

upwards of two centuries of adherence to the Arian heresy, were induced to abandon it and to submit to the church. The articles of faith form 23 heads of various length; after which follow 23 *Capitula*, or little chapters or heads of discipline.

The sixth of these is in the following words:

"The priests of God decree concerning freedmen, that if any are made by the bishops in the way the ancient canons permit, they shall be considered free; yet so that neither they nor their descendants shall retire from the patronage of the church. Let those freed by others and placed under the protection of the church be placed under the bishop's protection. Let the bishop ask this of his prince."

This *commendatio* was a guardianship. The custom was generally to make the church the guardian of those who were emancipated from servitude, yet the freedmen owed to his patron or guardian not only great respect but some little service or gift, in return for the protection he received.

The bishops about this period, in many places, were judges, to a certain extent, in those cases where their clergy or others under their charge or belonging to the church were concerned; but this not by divine right, nor by ecclesiastical authority, but by the concession and commission of the civil power. And this canon or chapter very regularly, when enacting that the bishop as patron should govern such clients or freed persons, refers to the proper source, by adding the expression, "Let the bishop ask his prince"—because the power of temporal rule is in the state not in the church, but when granted to the church by the state, it necessarily was not only validly but legally and properly used.

This too is taken into the body of the canon law.—(12 q. 2. de libertis.)

A custon had already gained considerable prevalence, which we shall find greatly extended in subsequent ages, of granting to the church slaves for its service and support. The administrators of the church property were called *familia fisci*. The church property was in ecclesiastical documents generally styled the *fisc*. The *fisca regis*, or royal fisc, was a different fund or treasury. It sometimes happened that the clergy who were the administrators sought to obtain from the "conditioned slaves" more than they were bound to give, and also, sometimes, others sought to have their service taken from the church. The *Capitulary VIII.* of this third Council of Toledo was enacted to remedy this latter grievance:

"By the suggestion, or by the command and with the consent of the most pious lord King Reccared, the council of priests directs that no

one shall dare to reclaim from the administrators of the church those clergy given by the prince, but having paid their tribute to the church of God, to which they are bound, let them, as long as they live, administer regularly."

In the same council, the canon xv. is the following:

"If any of the king's special servants shall have built churches and have enriched them by the contributions from their poverty, let the bishop obtain that it be confirmed by the royal authority."

The *servi fiscales* were the private or patrimonial property of the king; and Binius and Garcia remark that in this canon the *fiscus* means the royal patrimony, as is plain from the edict of the king by which he embodied the temporal enactments found in those canons into the body of the Spanish law, and also enacted fines to his treasury, or confiscation for the violation of any of the decrees of the council.

This also exhibits the principle that the slave was not permitted to contribute, without the consent of his owner, to religious establishments, and in several instances, and as a general principle, nothing could be more wise and just.

I shall conclude my observations for the present by producing a canon from that collection which is styled that of *Quinisextum*, or the assembly held in 692, in Constantinople, in the hall of the palace called Trulla, whence it is called *Concilium Trullanum*, or the Council of Trullo. Some of the acts of this assembly were set aside by the church as exceedingly irregular and of no force, but, other canons, exhibited as theirs, are in perfect conformity with the doctrine and discipline of the Universal Church and generally received as known and admitted rules of discipline. The following is one not only unobjected to, but conformable to what was the general usage. I have before me the Greek original and a Latin accurate translation. I cannot so conveniently have the former printed and shall, therefore, give the latter.

Canon lxxxv. "We have learned from the Scripture that every word is confirmed in two or three witnesses. We therefore decree, that slaves who are manumitted by their masters shall be admitted to enjoy that honour under three witnesses, who may be able to afford security by their presence to the freedom, and who may be able to secure credit for the acts done in their view."

Thus we have at this period, the legislation respecting slavery in all the portions of the church from the Ganges to the Atlantic, and from Scythia to Ethiopia. We find in Ireland piracy and robbery, and the reducing of freemen by violence in a time of peace by private marauders, and carrying them into bondage into remote countries, condemned

by excommunication; but we find domestic slavery of every grade tolerated, and we find slaves to be property of the church.

I shall, I hope, be able to continue without interruption, to follow up my evidence.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 22, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—Perhaps it would be as well that I should give, at length, the following passage from the venerable Bede, (*Hist. Ecclesiast. Gent. Anglor.* Lib. ii. c. 1.) It will at least show the readers of these letters a little morsel of that punning, which was fashionable in the decline of the Roman power, even amongst the best scholars and the most holy men:—

"Nor is that notice of the blessed Gregory which has come down to us by the tradition of our ancestors to be silently passed over: for by reason of the admonition that he then received, he became so industrious for the salvation of our nation. For they say, that on a certain day when merchants had newly arrived, many things were brought into the market and several persons had come to purchase; Gregory himself came amongst them, and saw exposed for sale, youths of a fair body and handsome countenance, whose hair was also beautiful. Looking at them, they say, he asked from what part of the world they were brought; he was told from the island of Britain, whose inhabitants were of that complexion. Again he asked whether these islanders were Christians or were immersed in the errors of paganism. It was said: that they were pagans. And he, sighing deeply, said, 'Alas! what a pity that the author of darkness should possess men of so bright a countenance, and that so graceful an aspect should have a mind void of grace within!' Again he inquired what was the name of their nation. He was told that they were called Angles. He said, 'It is well, for they have angelic faces, and it is fit that such should be the coheirs with angels in Heaven.' From what province were they brought, was his next inquiry. To which it was answered: The people of their province are called Deiri. 'Good again,' said he, 'Deiri, (de irâ eruti) rescued from anger and called to the mercy of Christ.' What is the name of the king of that province? He was told Aella. And playing

upon the word, he responded 'Alleluia.' The praises of God our Creator ought to be chaunted in those regions. And going to the pontiff of the Roman Apostolic See, for he was not yet made Pope himself, he besought him to send to Britain for the nation of the Angles, some ministers of the word through whom they may be converted to Christ; and stated that he was himself ready, the Lord being his aid, to undertake this work, if the Pope should so please. This he was not able to do, for though the pontiff desired to grant his petition, the citizens of Rome would not consent that he should go to so great distance therefrom; as soon, however, as he was placed in the office of Pope, he performed his long-desired work; he sent other preachers, but he aided by his prayers and exhortations that he might make their preaching fruitful."

This occurred about the year 577, and Gregory became Pope in 590. In the interim, the zealous monk prayed and reflected on the subject, and we find that soon after his elevation to the Pontifical dignity, he sought to purchase some of the British youths, in order to have them trained up to be missionaries to their countrymen.

The Holy See had already a considerable patrimony in Gaul, bestowed by the piety of the faithful; we shall see, from the following epistle of the Pope to the priest Candidus, whom he sent as its administrator, the use which was made of its income.

Gregory to the Priest Candidus going to the patrimony of Gaul. Book V. Epistle X:

"As you are going, with the aid of the Lord Jesus Christ, our God, to govern the patrimony which is in Gaul; we desire that out of the shillings you may receive, you, our beloved, should purchase clothing for the poor, or English youths about the age of seventeen or eighteen, that being placed in monasteries they may be useful for the service of God; so that the money of Gaul, which ought not to be expended in our land, may be laid out in its own place beneficially. If you can also get any of the money of that income called tolls (*ablatæ*), we also desire that you should therewith buy clothing for the poor, or as we have before said, youths who may become proficients in the service of God. But as they who dwell in that place are pagans, it is our desire that a priest be sent with them, lest they should get sick on the journey, and he ought to baptize those whom he may see in a dying state. So let you, our beloved do, and be alert in fulfilling what we have desired."

The commission of Pope Gregory the Great to Candidus was to purchase those youths, and, as we learn from other sources, it was executed. But, as Lingard observes, (*Ant. Anglo-Saxon* Chh. chapter i.) "their progress was slow; and his zeal impatient." The result was that

St. Augustine and his companions were sent by the Pope, and effected the conversion of the island.

In the same chapter, Lingard describes the Saxons who had settled in England, previous to their conversion, and for that portion which I quote, he refers amongst others to William of Malmesbury (*de reg.* l. i., c. 3,) and the testimony is well sustained by others.

"The savages of Africa may traffic with the Europeans for the negroes whom they have seized by treachery, or captured in open war; but the most savage conquerors of the Britons sold without scruple, to the merchants of the continent, their countrymen, and even their own children."

Nor was slavery abolished by the introduction of Christianity, but its rigours were greatly mitigated. Lingard, in the next page (31) informs us —

"But their ferocity soon yielded to the exertions of the missionaries, and the harsher features of their origin were insensibly softened under the mild influence of the Gospel. In the rage of victory they learned to respect the rights of humanity. Death or slavery was no longer the fate of the conquered Britons; by their submission, they were incorporated with the victors; and their lives and property were protected by the equity of their Christian conquerors. . . . . The human idea, that by baptism, all men became brethren, contributed to meliorate the condition of slavery, and scattered the seeds of that liberality, which gradually undermined, and at length abolished so odious an institution. By the provision of the legislature, the freedom of the child was secured from the avarice of an unnatural parent; and the heaviest punishment was denounced against the man, who presumes to sell to a foreign master one of his countrymen, though he were a slave or a malefactor."

Doctor Lingard refers to the laws of Ina 23, 24, 32, 46, as they are found in Wilkins. I cannot have reference myself to these laws. I had some time since, a copy in my library, of which some one thought proper to deprive me. Nor can I find a copy in this city; but I have no doubt whatever of Lingard's correctness. Ina did not ascend the throne until the year 688, and it was in the fifth year of his reign that he assembled the Witnagemot, or parliament, in which those laws were enacted. We shall, henceforth, have under our eye the legislation on the subject of slavery in England, and shall find that upwards of five hundred years more elapsed before slavery approached the term of abolition in that island.

We have seen Pope Gregory the Great purchasing slaves in order to have them educated and ordained; and unless I should show from his

works that he regarded and taught the compatibility of slave holding with the practice of religion, this may be urged as an evidence of abolitionism and of the incompatibility of slavery with his notions of justice. I shall therefore produce evidence to this effect.

In his book *Pastoralis Curæ, Of the Pastoral Care*, part 3, Caput i., Admonit. vi., is the following:

Admonition vi.—"Servants are to be admonished in one way, masters in another way. Servants indeed that they should always regard in themselves the lowliness of their condition: masters, however, that they lose not the recollection of their nature by which they are created upon a level with their slaves. Slaves are to be admonished not to despise their masters, lest they offend God, if growing proud they contradict his ordinance: masters too are to be admonished; because they grow proud against God by reason of his gift, if they do not acknowledge as their equals, by the fellowship of nature, those whom by condition they hold as subjects. These are to be admonished that they be mindful that they are the slaves of their masters: those that they recollect that they are the fellow-servants of servants. To these it is said: Servants, obey your masters in the flesh, and again, Whosoever are servants under the yoke: let them consider their masters worthy of all honour: but to those it is said, And you, masters, do in like manner to them: laying aside threats: knowing that your and their master is in heaven."

In his book ii. of *Epistles*, Epistle xxxix., writing to Peter, a subdeacon of the Campania, he directs him how to act in the case of a female slave belonging to a proctor or manager of church property (*defensor*), who was anxious to be allowed to become a sister in a monastery, which was not lawful without the consent of her owner. The Pope neither orders the master to manumit her nor to permit her profession, for though he was employed by the church, the religion to which he belonged did not require of him to give away his property, nor had the head of that church power to deprive him thereof; hence he writes:

"Moreover, because the proctor Felix is said to have a servant named Catilla, who with many tears and vehement desire wishes to obtain the habit of religion; but her aforesaid master will not, by any means, permit her making profession: it is then our desire that your experience would call upon the said Felix, and carefully examine the disposition of that young woman, and if you should find it such as is stated, pay to the master her price and send her hither with discreet persons to be placed, with God's help, in a monastery. But do this, so that the soul of the young woman may not suffer any inconvenience in her desire, through your tardiness."

The following is a deed of gift which the same Pope made, to assure the possession of a slave to the Bishop of Porto, a suburban see near Rome. It is curious not merely as exhibiting the fact that the Pope and the See of Rome held and transferred slaves at this period, but also as giving a specimen of a legal document of that date and tenor. Book x., Epistle lii.—*Gregorious, Felici Episcopo Portuensi*:

"Excited by our regard for your charitable person, that we may not appear to be useless to you, especially as we know you are short of servants: we therefore give and grant to you our brother, by our direct right, John, a servant of the church domain, by birth a Sabine, of the Flavian property, now aged about eighteen years, whom, by our will, you have a good while had in your possession. So that you may have and possess him, and preserve and maintain your right to him and defend him as your property. And that you may, by the free right of this donation, enjoy the exercise of your will, to do what you may think proper in his regard, as his lord.

"Against which paper of our munificence, you may know that neither we nor our successors are ever to come. And we have read this deed of gift, written out by our notary, and have subscribed the same, not even awaiting your profession, respecting the time you would desire license to register it in the public acts by interposing the lawful process of signature and covenant. Done at Rome," and so forth.

The Massa was generally a portion of the land: and the servants belonging specially thereto are in the documents of this and a later period generally called either *servi de* (or *ex*) *massa*, and when they subsequently became conditioned, or freed to a certain extent, they were called *homines de Masnada*, or other names equivalent thereto.

I shall reserve in my next, a form of manumission by which this pope liberated two slaves.

I shall conclude for this day by giving the following document respecting the release of captives. Book v. Epistle xxxiv.—*Gregorius, Anthemio Suddiacono*:

"We cannot express how great is our grief and the affliction of our heart, by reason of what has occurred in a part of Campania; but you may yourself estimate it from the extent of the calamity. Wherefore we send to your experience, by Stephen, a worthy man, the bearer hereof, money for the aid of those captives, who are detained; admonishing you that you ought to be very industrious and exert yourself to discover what freemen are unable to procure their own release, and that you should quickly redeem them. But respecting the slaves, when you shall discover that their masters are so poor as not to have it

in their power to release them, you will also not omit to buy them. In like manner you will be careful to redeem the servants of the church who have been lost through your neglect.

"You will also be very careful by all means to make a neat brief, which you can bring when you come, containing their names, as also where any one remains, how he is employed, or whence he is. You will be diligent and so industrious in this transaction as to give no cause of danger by your neglect for those who are to be released, nor run the risk of being exceedingly culpable in our view. You will be most particular, above all things, to procure the release of the captives at the lowest possible rate. You will make out the accounts as accurately and as clearly as posible, and send them to us with speed."

The calamity which he bewails was an incursion of the Lombards, who coming originally from Scandinavia, settled for a while in Pomerania, and about this period ravaged Italy.

We perceive in this epistle the redemption of the freemen, that of slaves whose masters were too poor to pay their ransom, and who were restored by the Pope to their owners, and we find the slaves belonging to the church. Thus we have as much evidence as we need desire, for the compatibility of domestic slavery with true religion at this period.

I shall in my next produce still further evidence from the writings of this excellent witness, Pope St. Gregory the Great, in whose honour the present Pontiff chose the name that he so worthily bears.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER X

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 14, 1821.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—Before I proceed farther, it may be useful, if not necessary, to advert to the laws of the Roman empire respecting Jews and Christians, and also respecting pagans and Christians, and several of the early sects and Catholics, so far as they regarded slavery. But as the basis of the law should be known, that we may properly learn its nature, it is fit that we should consider how the slave was treated.

The Jew and the Christian were unfortunately in opposition from the very origin of Christianity. The first persecutors of the Christians were the relatives of the first Christians; the death of the Saviour and the martyrdom of Stephen, the imprisonment of Peter, the mission of

Saul to Damascus, and a variety of other similar facts, exhibit to us in strong relief the unfortunate spirit of hatred which caused not merely separation, but enmity. The destruction of Jerusalem, the captivity of the once-loved people who preserved the early records of revelation, and the increase of the Christian religion, even under the swords and the gibbets of its persecutors, only increased and perpetuated this feeling.

The pride of the gentile ridiculed what he denominated superstition: whilst he smote the believer whom he mocked, he boweed before the idol of paganism. The early heresies of those who professed the Christian name, but separated from Christian unity, sprung generally from the efforts to destroy the mysterious nature of the doctrine of the Apostles, and to explain it by the system of some gentile philosopher, such as Manes or Plato, or to modify it by superinducing some Judaic rite or principle. The Jew, the gentile, and the heretic equally felt elevated by his imagined superiority over the faithful follower of the doctrine of the Galilean, as the Saviour was called. Thus the sword of the persecutor, the scoff of ridicule, and the quibbling of a false philosophy, were all employed against the members of the universal church; and amongst those who were by their situation the most exposed to suffering, were the unfortunate Christian slaves of the enemies of the cross. Even they who belonged to the faithful had peculiar trials, because frequently in times of persecution masters desirous of obtaining protection, without actually sacrificing to idols, compelled their servants to personate them in perpetrating the crime, as is evident from many documents. I may name one, Canon v: of Peter of Alexandria—

They were frequently circumcised, even against their will, by the Jewish owners. *Canon* ii. of Nice I: (Arab. 84), *Si quem servorum circumciderunt.*

They were frequently mutilated by the infidel master. (*Ibid.*Q They were also exposed to the continued hardships and enticements of owners who desired to make them proselytes, as may be seen in various records.

It was, therefore, at an early period after the conversion of Constantine, enacted that no one who was not a Christian should hold a Christian slave, upon that principle contained in *Leviticus* xxv. 47, 48. We find in the Civil Code, book i. title 10:

"A Jew shall not purchase a Christian slave, nor shall he obtain one by title of gift, nor by any other title."

In a subsequent part of the title the penalty is recited, "*non solum mancipii damno mulctetur, verum etiam capitali sententia punietur.*"

"Not only shall he be mulcted by the loss of the slave, but he shall be punished by a capital sentence."

By a decree of Valentinian III. found after the *Theodosian Code*, and entitled, *De diversis ecclesiasticis capitibus*, bearing date 425, Aquileia, vii. of the ides of July, Jews and pagans were prohibited from holding Christian slaves.

Thus by the law of the empire at this period no Jew or gentile could have any property in a Christian slave. We shall however see that this principle was not adopted until a much later period by the Franks and other nations, and this will account for the diversity of legislation and of judgment which the books of the same period exhibit in various regions.

Another clause of the code was more comprehensive: "A Greek or pagan, a Jew, a Samaritan, and any heretic, that is, one not orthodox, cannot hold a Christian slave."

Another provision of the civil code regulated prohibitions of those customs which frequently were used by the Jews to ridicule the Christian ceremonies, (lib. i. tit. ix. *De Judæis et Cœlicolis.*) This law prohibited to Jews or pagans all rites in imitation of Christian ceremonies, or the use of the cross in any ceremonial of their own.

It was not unusual, at a much later period, for the Jews in some parts of Gaul where they were numerous, and indeed in parts of other regions, to insult the Christians in the holy week during the performance of some of their ceremonies, especially their processions; whence arose very serious riots and tumults, with all their bad consequences: to prevent which, as soon as the Catholics had power, they enacted laws of restraint, one of which is Canon xxx. of the third Council of Orleans, 538:

"Because through the mercy of God we are placed under the government of Catholic kings, let the Jews not presume to go among the Christians from Maunday Thursday to Easter Monday, that is, during four days; nor on any account anywhere to mingle with the Christian people."

The first Council of Maçon, on the Saone, in 581, in its Canon xiv. quotes the law of King Childebert for this prohibition, and states the reason, whilst it gives the prohibition a greater extent: "Let them not have liberty of walking through the streets or the market for the purpose of insult."

Childebert died in 558.

I have thought it necessary to advert to these facts, and thus to state the law, to show the ground and the object of the several enactments

and judgments that will appear in my subsequent inquiry, and to show the various causes that led to modify slavery itself. I could have easily gone into more references, but this, I hope, will suffice.

We have, in a letter of Pope St. Gregory the Great, to Libertinus the prefect of Sicily, evidence of the manner in which one of the Jews violated both the enactments of the civil code, viz, that which forbade the interference with the religious rites of Christians and that which rendered the Jew incapable of holding Christian slaves. The case into which he orders an inquiry was that of a man, who, though of the Jewish nation, appears rather to have attempted the establishment of a new sect, or the mockery of Christianity, than the proselyting to the Jewish observances; for the Jewish ceremonial did not recognise such worship as he sought to introduce.

It must also be observed that at this period the authority of Gregory over Sicily was not, as at present, spiritual. He had a temporal supervision, if not a full sovereignty, over the island.

The document is Epistle xxxvii, liber ii. indict xi:

"Gregory to Libertinus, Prefect of Sicily:

"Concerning the presumption of Nasas, a Jew, who had erected an altar in the name of the blessed Elias; and concerning the procuring of Christian slaves.

"God has willed that, from the very beginning of your administration, you should proceed to the avenging of his cause; and he has mercifully kept this reward for you with praise. It is indeed said that Nasas, a very wicked man of the Jewish people, has, with a rashness deserving punishment, constructed an altar under the name of the blessed Elias, and deceitfully and sacrilegiously seduced many Christians thither for adoration. It is also said that he has procured Christian slaves, and put them to his service and profit. It has also been written to us, that the most glorious Justin, when he ought to have most severely punished him for such crimes, has, through the soothing of his avarice, put off the avenging of this injury to God.

"Do you, glorious sir, most closely examine into all the premises; and if you shall find the allegations evidently sustained, hasten to proceed most strictly to have bodily justice done upon this wicked Jew, so as to procure for yourself the favour of God in this case, and to exhibit for your reward, to those who will come after us, an example of imitation. But, farther, do you carry through, according to the prescriptions of the laws, to their liberty, without any cavilling, every and any Christian slaves that it may be evident he procured, lest, which God

forbid, the Christian religion should be degraded by subjection to the Jews.

"Therefore, do all this correction most exactly and quickly, that you may not only have our thanks for preserving discipline, but that we may, when opportunity offers, give you proof of our recognition for your goodness."

I have before, in Letter VII., quoted the thirty-first canon of the fourth Council of Orleans, to show that the penalty of forfeiture of the slave was enacted by the council, necessarily with the consent and by the authority of King Childebert; for only the civil power could make such a law when a Jewish owner attempted to make a proselyte of that slave. This shows, that, at that period, the laws of the Franks allowed the Jews to possess Christian slaves.

The canon xxx. of the same council, to which I also alluded in the same letter, is the following:

"Whereas, it has been decreed by former canons, respecting the Christian slaves that are under the Jews, that if they should fly to the church, or even to any Christians, and demand their redemption, and be unwilling to serve the Jews, they should be freed from their owners upon a fair price being assessed by the faithful and tendered for them: we therefore enact that this, so just a regulation, shall be observed by all Catholics."

Thus it is evident, that at this period, 541, in this province and kingdom the Jew had a good title to his Christian slave, and could not be deprived of him except by law, or for value tendered,—and this was acknowledged by the Council.

The reference to former canons is principally to the thirteenth of the third Council of Orleans, to which I alluded in my Letter VI.

The first Council of Maçon was assembled at the request of King Guntram or Goutran, one of the sons of Clotaire I., to whom the division of Orleans was left upon the death of his father in 561. This assembly was held in 581. The portions of its canons which regarded temporalities had their sanction from the civil authority of the monarch.

The sixteenth canon is the following:

"And although the mode of acting in regard to Christians who have been entangled in the service of the Jews by the invasions for making captives, or by other frauds, has been regulated heretofore not only by canonical enactments, but also by favour of the civil laws; yet because now the complaint of some persons has arisen, that some Jews dwelling in the cities and towns have grown so insolent and bold that they will not permit the Christians demanding it to be freed, even upon

the ransom of their service: wherefore, by the authority of God, we enact by this present act of Council, that no Christian shall henceforth lawfully continue enslaved to a Jew; but that any Christian shall have the power of redeeming that slave, either to freedom or to servitude, upon giving for each good slave the sum of twelve shillings (*solidum*): because it is improper that they whom Christ redeemed by the shedding of his blood, should continue bound in the chains of persecutors. But if any Jew shall be unwilling to acquiesce in these enacted provisions, it shall be lawful for the slave himself to dwell where he will, with Christians, as long as the Jew shall keep from taking the stipulated money. This also is specially enacted, that if any Jew shall be convicted of having persuaded his Christian slave to the adoption of the Jewish error, he shall be deprived of the slave, and amerced to make a gift."

Thus, it was only at this period that we find any of the laws of the Franks introducing the right of a Christian to refuse service to a Jew. This, however, was not the case in all the territory; for that over which Guntram ruled was but a fourth part of the empire of this people.

We now proceed to examine another document of Pope Gregory the Great respecting Etruria. The town of Luna was in the Ligurian region, at the mouth of the river Macra, now La Magra. In or about 856, it became too inconsiderable to be continued a bishop's see, and its diocess was united to the territory belonging to the see of Sarzana, about five miles higher up the river.

The following is epistle xxi., liber iii., indic. xii.:

"Gregory to Verantius, Bishop of Luna:

"That Jews should not have Christian slaves,—but that colonists, and those born on their lands, should pay them pensions.

"We have learned, by the report of many persons, that Christian slaves are kept in servitude by the Jews dwelling in the city of Luna, which is the more grievous to us, as it has been caused by the remissness of you our brother. For it was becoming of you, as well by reason of the place you hold, as from your regard for the Christian religion, not to allow the existence of any occasion by which simple souls may be subjected to the Jewish superstition—not only by the force of persuasion, but by a sort of right arising from power. Wherefore we exhort you, our brother, that, according to the regulation of the most pious laws, it should not be permitted to any Jew to keep a Christian slave under his dominion; and that, if any such be found under them, the liberty of such should be secured by the process of law, and the aid of protection.

"And as regards those who are on their lands, though, by strict

construction of law, they may be free,—yet, because they have remained a long time in the cultivation of the soil, as bound to the condition of the place, let them remain to till the lands as they have used to do, and pay their pension to the aforesaid men; and let them do all that the laws require of colonists or persons of origin. Let no additional burden, however, be laid on them.

"But, should any one of these desire to migrate to another place, or should he prefer remaining in his obedience, let the consequences be attributed to him who rashly violated the colonial rights, or who injured himself by the severity of his conduct towards his subject.

"It is our wish that you be careful so to give your attention to all these matters, as not to be the guilty pastor of a plundered flock,—nor that your want of zeal should compel us to reprehend our brother."

It may not be amiss now, viewing this document, to bring more closely under our eye the law of the empire which was in force through Italy and Sicily.

1. Slaves who were Christians could not be held by those who were not Christians.

2. It being unlawful for others than Christians to hold them, these others could have no property in them; the persons so held were entitled to their freedom.

3. The church was the guardian of their right to freedom, and the church acted through the bishop.

4. Consequently it was the duty, as it was the right, of the bishop to vindicate that freedom for those so unjustly detained.

5. The right and duty of the Pope was to see that each bishop was careful in his charge, and this part of his charge came as much as any other did under the supervision of his natural superior and immediate inspector, and it was the duty of that superior to reprehend him for any neglect.

6. The law of each country was to regulate the duty of the master and slave, and if that law made, as in Italy and its environs it did, the church the proper tribunal for looking to the performance of those duties, any neglect of the church in its discharge would be criminal.

7. Through the greater part of Italy and Sicily, at this period, the Pope was in fact virtually, if not openly and fully, the sovereign, and it was only by his paramount influence that the half-civilized Gothic and Lombard chiefs were kept in any order, and their despotism partially restrained.

They were times of anarchy, between which and the present no analogy exists. The Jews and separatists from the church were very

numerous, and on their side, as well as on that of their opposers, passion frequently assumed the garb of religion, and the unfortunate slave was played upon by each. The position of the Pope was exceedingly difficult, for whilst he had to restrain the enemies of the church on one side, he had to correct the excesses of its partisans upon the other. In my next letter I shall exhibit, for the purpose of placing the conduct of the Pope in its proper point of view, some documents calculated to sustain the assertions I have here made.

I shall for the present conclude by giving the substantial distinctions found in the civil law between some classes of those called *conditionati*, or "persons under condition."

The *coloni*, or "colonists," were persons who were bound to the soil and could not leave it; if the land were sold, they were sold with it, and their descendants were also fastened to the soil. They had the use of the ground upon certain conditions; generally the payment of a certain rent in money, or the giving of a centain proportion of the produce, or a stipulated quantity without regard to proportion. They were distinguished into *originarii*, persons of origin, that is, born on the ground, or *adscriptitii*, adopted or written to it. The "advena," or stranger coming upon the ground and fulfilling the conditions without any special bargain, was prescribed against after thirty years, so that he thereby was legally a colonist without any farther formality. Or if he chose at once to become a colonist, it was done by a written instrument in duplicate between him and the lord of the soil, that is, by a pair of indentures.

In the case of the colonists of Luna it would appear that, if they were not legally prescribed against, there was what the Pope considered to be equitable claim on the part of the Jewish owners of the soil to their services; but that if any one of them chose to use his right of going elsewhere, it must be seen that the original wrong was on the side of the landholder, who sought to bind to his service a person whom the law prevented from being his servant, or the Pope supposed that it would not probably happen that the colonist would use his right of departing if he were not badly used. And therefore, relying on the continuance of kind feelings, he advised the bishop to allow the colonists to continue without the destruction of their legal right of self-deliverance; whilst he required of the prelate the performance of his duty in procuring the release of the slave illegally detained in bondage.

I dwell longer on this epoch, not only because I herein find more

ample matter, but because at this period we discover serious alterations which greatly influenced the subsequent policy of Europe.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 20, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I stated in my last, that I felt it necessary in order to set the character of Pope St. Gregory the Great in a proper light, to give some documents which would show that he was as ready to restrain the excesses of the partisans of the church, and to protect the Jews, where they deserved protection, as he was to vindicate for the Christian slave his legal right to freedom, against the Jew that attempted to hold him irregularly in bondage.

I shall first exhibit his letter to an agent of the Holy See in Sicily. It is found liber vii. indic ii. epistle lix:

"Gregory to Fantinus the Proctor at Palermo; concerning the Synagogues of the Jews unreasonably taken possession of: We have some time back written to Victor our brother and fellow bishop; because some Jews in their petition to us complained that he had unreasonably taken possession of their synagogues with their dwellings thereto attached in the city of Palermo, that he should suspend using them for divine offices (*congregatione*) until the case should be examined so as to ascertain whether this was justly done, lest it may seem that the injury was done to them by mere wilfulness. And indeed the respect in which we hold his priesthood did not permit us easily to believe that our aforesaid brother had done anything unbecoming.

"But since we have found by the report of Salerius, our notary, who has been there subsequently, that there existed no reasonable cause for their being taken away: and that they were indiscreetly and rashly consecrated: we therefore command you, a man of experience, because that which has been once consecrated cannot any more be restored to the Jews; that it be your duty to see what amount shall be assessed by our sons Venantius Patrick and the Abbot Urbicius, as the value of the synagogues themselves together with the dwellings that are under them or united to their walls, and the gardens belonging thereto; so that our aforesaid brother and fellow-bishop should give for them that price; so that what he caused to be taken should become the property of the

church, and that they (the Jews) should by no means appear to suffer any injustice or be oppressed. Let the books and ornaments that were taken away be sought after: which, if they have been evidently taken away, we desire to be restored without any quibbling: and as we have before written that no license should be given them to do in the synagogues anything beyond what is regulated by law, so that on the other hand, there should not be done to them any damage or prejudice in violation of either justice or of equity."

The above document shows that if the bishop of Etruria was censured for not doing his duty to the Christians illegally in bondage by Jews, the same Pope was equally ready to censure another bishop, who in Sicily, treated the Jews unjustly, and to order not only compensation for their loss, but restitution of such portion of their goods as could be returned, and protection against illegal or unjust acts.

The letter to which Pope St. Gregory refers, is found in liber. vii. ind. 1. Epistle xxvi. and is the following:

"Gregory to Victor, Bishop of Palermo.

"Of not unjustly oppressing the Jews.—As it is not proper that license should be given to the Jews to presume to do anything in their synagogues beyond what is permitted by law: so in those things which are conceded to them they should suffer no prejudice.

"The accompanying petition, which has been presented to us by Hebrews dwelling in this city of Rome, on behalf of those who live at Palermo, will show you of what they complain. If, then, their complaints be founded on truth, it is fit that you, our brother, having diligently looked into the provisions of the law, should keep and observe, in their regard, all that is therein decreed, so that you should appear to do nothing unjust, and they not to suffer any prejudice. If, then, there be any reasonable ground of objection to restoring those things which are demanded, let judges be chosen by each of the parties, to determine what shall be according to equity. But if, perchance, the litigation cannot be thus terminated, (the cause must come up to ourself,)* so that what shall appear befitting justice, may be decreed without any suspicion being cast upon you. Meantime, until the cause shall be decided, do you, our brother, suspend any process to consecrate what is alleged to have been taken away."

The next letter in the same book is one to the same proctor, and shows the manner in which the Pope's tribunal was equally open to the Jews as to the Christian. The following is from Epistle lx:

"Gregory to the Proctor Fantinus:

*There has been some omission in transcribing the original at this place.—I. A. R.

"Concerning Jamnus the Jew.—The Jew Jamnus, the bearer of these presents, has exhibited to us that our proctor Candidus, with other creditors, have seized upon his ship and chattels, and have sold them for money that they lent to him, and that the aforesaid proctor kept back from amongst all the other securities that he restored to him, his written bond, and that he treated with contempt the several supplications which this man made for its return, upon the allegation that the principal of the debt was satisfied. We therefore command you, experienced sir, that you take heed to learn the facts with all exact sharpness; and if you shall find them as stated, press with very strict compulsion, so that without any delay whatever the proctor shall restore the security of the aforesaid bearer. So let your careful industry take heed that no complaint comes back again to us upon this case."

I shall now exhibit a document, showing not only the Pope's own disposition to avoid using forcible means to procure a seeming conversion to the church, but also proving very manifestly the care which the Jews had to prevent any improper efforts at proselytism to Christianity, and their success in the applications which they for this purpose made to the Holy See.

It is a letter to the Archbishop of Arles, in the southeast part of France, and to the Bishop of Marseilles, who was one of his suffragans. Both were men remarkable for piety and zeal. The letter is found in liber i. indi. ix., Epistle xlv:

"Gregory to Virgil of Arles, and Theodore, Bishop of Marseilles in Gaul:

"That Jews should not be baptized by compulsion, but should be warned to embrace the faith.

"Although there should be no occasion of fitting times or personal affairs for writing to our brethren and of returning their address of becoming salutation, yet it so happens that we can at the same time repay what is due for the love of your fraternal relationship, and not be silent regarding the complaint of certain persons which has been laid before us, as to the manner in which the souls of those who err may be saved.

"Indeed, several men of the Jewish religion, who dwell in this province, and who frequently journey to parts of Marseilles upon business, have brought to our cognizance that many of the Jews dwelling there are frequently led to the baptismal font, more by violence than by preaching.

"I consider the intention of those concerned to be indeed praiseworthy, and I admit that it was derived from the love of our Lord; but I fear that, unless a sufficient working of the spirit of the holy Scripture should accompany this intention, that either a work of merit will not

flow therefrom, or that in some measure, which God forbid, it would be followed by the loss of those souls that we would desire to save. For when any person comes to the fountain of baptism, not by the sweetness of preaching, but by compulsion, returning to his former superstition, he dies in a worse way by means of that from which he seemed to receive regeneration. Do you, our brethren, then urge these men by frequent preaching, so that they may desire to change their old life rather by the persuasion of the teacher. So will our intention be well made perfect, and the disposition of the convert not be turned to his former vomit. There should be used to them, then, such a form of speech as would burn up the thorns of their errors, and by the preaching illuminate what is dark in them; so that you, our brethren, may obtain a reward for your frequently admonishing them, and that God may, according to his bounty, bring them to the regeneration of a new life."

Besides the above, several similar are found amongst his epistles. Such as liber i., ind. ix., Epistle xxxiv., to Peter Bishop of Terracina, wherein, upon the complaint of Joseph, a Jew, that the bishop prevented the Jews from celebrating their festivities in a particular place, but consented to their celebration in a different location, and then expelled them from this second, the Pope reproves him for this unjust and unkind proceeding, and shows him how much more becoming and useful it would be to treat those who are estranged from Christian truth with mildness and affection. To the same purport is his Ep. xv., lib. xi., indic. vi., to Paschasius, Bishop of Naples, desiring that he would not permit any molestation of the Jews of that city, who complained to the Pope that they were prevented from the celebration of their festivals in the manner that they and their fathers had been accustomed to have them solemnly observed. Gregory tells them that too frequently this interference is the effect of human passion, and not the offspring of zeal. *Nam quicumque aliter agunt, et oes sub hoc velamine à consuetâ ritûs sui volunt cultura suspendere suas, illi magis quàm Dei causas probantur attendere.*

This spirit of affection and persuasion breathes also in his letter to the proctor Faustinus, liber vii., ind. I, Epistle xxiv., in which he gives directions how he is to act regarding a number of Jews in the vicinity of Agrigentum, or Girgenti, in Sicily, concerning whose good dispositions Domnina, the Abbess of St. Stephen's monastery in that region, had written to him.

The truth of his observation respecting human passion assuming the garb of zeal, is clearly sustained by the contents of one of his letters to Januarius, Bishop of Cagliari, in Sardinia, liber vii., ind. II, Epistle v., wherein he admonishes him to apply a proper remedy to the misconduct

of one Peter, who, being newly converted from Judaism to Christianity, gave great scandal on Easter Sunday, the very day succeeding that of his baptism. Leading a mob of ill-conducted persons, contrary to the advice and remonstrances of the good and the religious, this fanatic, or rogue, whichever he was, rushed to the synagogue, erected in it a cross and an image of the Blessed Virgin, and hung up there his own baptismal garment, though the bishop had, from a suspicion of his character, forewarned him against insulting those whom he left.

The Jews of Cagliari sent a deputation to complain of this to the Pope, and the deputies carried with them the certificate of the governor, of the military commander, and of other noble persons, showing the truth of the facts charged. The letter of the Pope requires that the Jews shall receive their synagogue and legal protection, that this Peter shall be restrained, his associates censured, the Catholic admonished, the cross, the image, and the robe be removed, and their synagogue left to the Jews. The bishop is praised for his opposition to the misconduct, and kindness and charity are inculcated.

In liber xii., indic. vii., Epistle xviii., we have a letter of this Pope to two bishops, Bacauda and Agnellus, commissioning them to examine the site of a synagogue at Terracina, for the possession of which the Jews had petitioned that they might have the papal sanction. It was represented to him that it was so near the church, that their chaunting was heard from one in the other. He desires that the aforesaid bishops, togeter with the Bishop of Terracina, shall, if such be the case, find another convenient site within the town, where the Jews could observe their solemnities, and forbids that they should on any account be molested or burdened, but that in all things they should have ample justice, according to the Roman law, but that they be not permitted to have Christian slaves.

I shall now exhibit a document showing the manner in which, by preventing the extensive introduction of even pagan slaves by the Jews, the increase of slavery was restained. It gave to every Jewish or pagan slave of a Jew, in those places where the law was in force, the strongest inducement to make a profession of the Christian religion, whether in sincerity or in hypocrisy. It is found in liber v. indic. xiv. epistle xxxi:

"Gregory to Fortunatus, Bishop of Naples:"

"That slaves who wish to embrace the Christian faith must not be sold to Jews, but (the owners) may receive a price from a Christian purchaser.

"We have before now written to you, our brother, that their masters should not have leave to sell those who, by the inspiration of God, desire

to come from the Jewish superstition to the Christian faith; but that from the moment they shall have manifested this determination they should be, by all means, protected to seek their liberty. But, as we have been led to know some persons, not exactly and accurately giving heed to our will, nor to the enactments of the laws, think that, as regards pagan slaves, this law does not apply, it is fit that you, our brother, should be careful on this head; and if amongst the slaves of the Jews not only a Jew, but any of the pagans should desire to become a Christian, to see that no Jew should have power to sell him under any pretext, or by any ingenious device, after this his intention shall have been made known; but let him who desires to become of the Christian faith have the aid of your defence, by all means, for his liberty.

"And respecting those who are to lose such servants, lest they should consider themselves unreasonably hindered, it is fit that you should carefully follow this rule: that, if it should happen that pagans whom they brought from foreign places for the purposes of traffic, should within three months, not having been purchased, fly to the church and say that they desire to be Christians, or even make known this intention without the church, let the owners be capable of receiving their price from a Christian purchaser. But if, after the lapse of three months, any one of those servants of this description should speak his will and wish to become a Christian, no one shall thereafter dare to purchase him, nor shall his master under any pretext sell him; but he shall unquestionably be brought to the reward of liberty, because it is sufficiently intelligible that this slave was procured for the purpose of service, and not for that of traffic. Do you, my brother, diligently and closely observe all these things, so that you be not led away by any supplication, nor affected by personal regard."

The grounds of the law above given may be partially gathered from the following, which is a letter to a bishop of Catania in Sicily. Liber v., ind. xiv., epistle xxxii:

"Gregory to Leo, Bishop of Catania:

"Concerning Samaritans (or Jews) who purchased pagan slaves and circumcised them.

"Accounts have been brought to us of a transaction very detestable and altogether opposed to the laws, and which, if true, shows exceedingly great neglect on the part of you, our brother, and proves you to have been very culpable.

"We have found that some Jews dwelling at Catania have bought pagan slaves, and with rash presumption dared to circumcise them. Wherefore it is necessary that you should exert all your priestly zeal in

this case, and give your mind to examine closely into it with energy and care; and, should you find the allegation to be true, that you should by all means, and without delay, secure the liberty of the slaves themselves, and give them the protection of the church; nor should you suffer their masters, on any account, to receive any of the price given for them, for they not only should be fined in this amount, but they are liable also to suffer such other punishment as the laws inflict."

I shall in my next endeavour to conclude the documentary evidence which I think useful to extract from the mass that is contained in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, and meantime

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 28, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—In my third letter, I showed under the fifth head, that in Judea the creditor could take the children of the debtor, and keep them as his slaves to labour until the debt was paid; and amongst the gentiles this right was not only in existence, but in most cases the child could be subjected to perpetual slavery, and in many instances the debtor himself could thus be reduced to bondage: and in fact, sir, I believe we could easily discover herein the origin of imprisonment for debt.

A serious improvement has been made in this respect, as will be seen by the following document, found in liber iii., indic. xii., epistle xliii:

"Gregory, to the Proctor Fantinus:

"Of Cosmas, the Syrian, deeply in debt.

"The bearer hereof, Cosmas the Syrian, has informed us that he contracted many debts in the business in which he was engaged. We believe it to be true: he has testified it with many tears and witnesses. And, as he owes 150 shillings, I wish his creditors would make some composition with him. And as the law regulates that no freeman shall be held for a debt, if there be no goods which can be attached for that debt, he says that his creditors may be induced to accept 80 shillings; but it is extravagant on their part to ask 80 shillings from a man who has nothing. We have sent you 60 shillings by your notary, that you may have a discreet conference with his creditors, and explain matters to them, because they cannot legally hold his son whom they are said to keep. And

if they will come down to anything less, by your efforts, than the sum that we send, should anything remain of the 60 shillings, give it to him to help support himself and his son; should nothing be left, exert yourself to have his debt cancelled by that amount sent, so that henceforth he may be free to exert himself for his own benefit. But be careful, in doing this, to get for him a full receipt and discharge in writing for this money that they get."

The law to which the Pope refers, and by which the persons of the unfortunate debtor and his family were protected, is founded in Novell. 134, chapter 7, and was enacted by Justinian I. in 541:

"That no creditor should presume to retain for debt the son of the debtor.

"And because we have known that this sort of injustice has been allowed in several places of our commonwealth, that creditors presume to keep the children of their debtors, either in pledge or in slavish employment, or to hire them out, we by all means forbid all this: and we order that, if any person shall be guilty of any of these things, not only shall he lose the debt, but he shall in addition give an equal sum, to be paid to the person that was held by him, or to the parents of such person: and, beyond this, he shall be subjected to corporal punishment by the local judge, because he presumed to restrain or to hire out, or keep in pledge, a free person."

The ninth chapter of the same enactment prohibits the imprisonment of females for debt, or under process, or in any way under male custody.

The following document will exhibit in some degree the origin of the principle of escheats to be found in slavery. The slave being freed upon certain conditions, if they were not fulfilled the master of course re-entered upon his rights. The manumitted slave was sometimes allowed not only freedom, but a certain gift, and often with the condition that, if he had not lawful issue, the gift and its increase by his industry, should revert to the master or his heir. So, in aftertimes, the lord of the soil, or the monarch, gave portions of land to his vassals upon condition of service, and, upon failure of service or of heirs, his land escheated, or went back to the lord of the soil. It is curious that, in many of our republics, this slavish principle has extensive application.

The following document is found in liber v., indic. xiv., epistle xii:

"Gregory to Montana and Thomas.

"He emancipates them, and makes them Roman citizens.

"Since our Redeemer, the maker of every creature, mercifully vouchsafed to take human flesh, that breaking the chain by which we

were held captive, he may, by the grace of his divinity, restore us to our first liberty, it is then salutary that they whom he at first made free by nature, and whom the law of nations subjected to the yoke of slavery, should in the nature in which they were born be restored to liberty by that kindness of their emancipator; and therefore, moved by this consideration, and in respect to piety, we make you, Montana and Thomas, slaves of the holy Roman Church, in whose service we are by God's help engaged, from this day forward free and Roman citizens. And we release to you all your allowance of slavery.

"And because you, Montana, have declared it your wish to enter into the monastic state, we give and grant to you this day two ounces, which it is well known were formerly left as a legacy to you for inheritance by the priest Gaudiosus, to be by all means available to the monastery of St. Lawrence, over which Constantina is superioress, and into which you desire anxiously by God's mercy to be admitted. If it appears that you have concealed any of the effects of the said Gaudiosus, the entire doubtless is by right for the service of our church.

"But to you, the said Thomas, whom, in addition to the bestowal of freedom, we desire to be enrolled in service amongst our notaries, we likewise this day give and grant, by this charter of manumission, five ounces which the same Gaudiosus the priest left to you by name in his last will, and the portion which he assigned for your mother, but upon this ground and condition well attached, that, should you die without issue by lawful marriage, all those goods which we have granted to you shall come back, without any diminution, under the dominion of the holy Roman Church; but should you leave behind you children lawfully recognised from your marriage, we give to you full power to hold the same effects as their owner, and without any condition, and to make free disposition of the same by will.

"Know you, therefore, that what we have thus, by this charter of manumission, enacted and granted to you, bind, without any gainsay, ourselves and our successors for its observance. For the order of justice and of reason requires that he who desires his own commands to be observed by his successors, should also doubtless observe the will and the statutes of his predecessor.

"We have dictated this writing of manumission to be copied by our notary Paterius, and have for its most perfect stability subscribed it with our hand, and with those of three of the more dignified priests and three deacons, and delivered them to you.

"Done in the city of Rome," and so forth.

One of the subjects which at all times caused slavery to be sur-

rounded with great difficulties was the result of marriage. The interest of the owner frequently interfered with the affection of the husband and wife, and also was irreconcilable to the relation of parent and child. The liability to separation of those married was a more galling affliction in the Christian law, where the Saviour made marriage indissoluble; and it often happened that an avaricious or capricious owner cared as little for the marriage bond, as he did for the natural tie of affection. Hence, as Christianity became the religion of the state, or of the great body of the people, it was imperatively demanded, by the very nature of the case, that some restraint should be placed upon that absolute power which the owners had, and sometimes abused, of wantonly making these separations. On the other hand, the association of the sexes made marriage desirable; it was ordained by God to be the general state of the bulk of mankind, and even the self-interest or the avarice of the master calculated upon its results. Then, again, the slave dreaded separation, not only because of the violence committed on the most sacred affections,—but also because, though the husband and wife should be separated by impassable barriers, yet the bond of their union subsisted, and could be severed by death alone.

This was a strong temptation to both master and slave to prefer concubinage to wedlock. This is one of the worst moral evils attending slavery, where no restraint of law effects its removal.

Another difficulty arose, especially in cases of the colonist, by reason of the claims of the several owners where colonists of distinct estates and different owners intermarried. In the case of perfect slaves, the child generally followed the mother, both as regarded condition and property. This was not, however, universally the case. But the owners of colonized lands set up different claims. At length the dispute was settled in the Roman empire by a law of Justinian, in 539, Novell. clxii. caput 3, and confirmed by a decision in a case brought up by the churchwardens of Apamea in Phrygia, in 541, on the kalends of March, by dividing equally the progeny between the estates to which the parents belonged, giving the preference, in all cases of uneven number, to that estate to which the mother was attached, (Nov. clvii. tit. xxxix).

The following law concerning marriages and the separation of married persons from each other, and of children from their parents, is of the same date:

"Of country persons who contract marriage on divers estates. The Emperor Justinian Augustus, to Lazarus the Count of the East:

"Preamble.—We have learned by relation in various ways, that a

delinquency quite unworthy of our times is allowed in the provinces of Mesopotamia and of Osdroene. They have a custom of having marriage contracted between those born on different estates; whence the masters endeavour to dissolve marriages actually contracted, or to take away from the parents the children who are their issue; upon which account that entire place is miserably afflicted, whilst country people, husbands and wives, are drawn away from each other, and the children whom they brought into light are taken away from them: and that there needs for the regulation only our provision.

"Chapter I.—Wherefore, we enact, that otherwise the masters of the aforesaid keep their colonists as they will; but, it shall not be allowed by virtue of any custom heretofore introduced and in existence, to put away from each other those who are married, or to force them to cultivate the land belonging to themselves, or to take away children from their parents, under the colour of colonial condition. And you will be careful that if anything of this sort has haply been already done, the same be corrected and restitution made, whether it be that children were taken away from their parents, or women from their consorts of marriage. And for any who shall in future presume to act in this way, it shall be at the hazard of losing the estate itself.

"Wherefore, let marriages of servants be exempt from that fear which has hitherto hung over them: and from the issue of this order, let the parents have their children. It shall not be competent for the lords of the estates to strive by any subtle arguments either to take away those who contract marriage, or their children. For he who shall presume to do any such thing, shall incur the risk of losing that estate for which he attempts to claim those colonists.

"Epilogue.—That, therefore, which has been good in our view, and is declared by this sacred pragmatic form, let your magnificence provide to have carried into execution, and the cohort which obeys you, as also he who for the time being shall hold the same magisterial office. To the end, then, that this edict may produce its effect and continue in force, let him who may at any time violate its enactments be liable to a penalty of three pounds of gold.

"Given at Constantinople, on the kalends of May, our most pious Lord Justinian, being Augustus, and the most renowned Basil being Consul."

This was an important amelioration of the worst feature of slavery: but, still the master's right to the labour was left untouched, whilst the rights of nature and of religion were secured to the colonist, and the transition from absolute slavery to the colonial condition was imper-

ceptibly diminishing the number of those in the former, and increasing those in the latter condition. It became a principle, where an estate was large, and the colonists numerous, to confine the choice of the servants within the bounds of the property; and thus marriage had its full sanctity, and families remained without separation.

We have an instance of the exercise of this right, by Pope St. Gregory, in a document found in Liber X., indic. v., Epistle 28:

"Gregory to the Proctor Romanus:

"Of not marrying the children of Peter the Proctor, without the limits of the estate upon which they were born.

"You, experienced sir, are well aware that Peter, whom we made a proctor, is a native of the estate of our church territory which is called Vitelas. And as our desire is to act towards him with such favour as is compatible with avoiding any injury to the church, we command you by this precept, that you should strictly warn him not to presume under any pretext or excuse, to have his children joined in wedlock anywhere but on that estate to which they may be bound by law or by condition; in which matter it is quite necessary that you, experienced sir, be very careful, and instil into them a fear to prevent any of them from going on any account beyond the estate to which they are subject by origin; for if any one of them shall presume, as we believe he will not, to go thence; let him be assured that he shall never have our consent either to dwell or to associate himself without the estate on which he was born, but that the land of any such person shall be more heavily charged (*superscribi*). And know you, that if by your negligence, any of them shall attempt to do any of those things which we prohibit, you will incur no small danger."

Many of the restrictions on marriage that are found in subsequent ages, under the feudal system, had their origin in this principle, because indeed the vassal, in feudal times, was but a slave, under a more loose dominion, in a mitigated form.

The following document shows, that, at least in the West, the separation of married persons was very uncommon, (*quam sit inauditum atque crudele,*) (unheard of and cruel.) It is found in Liber III., indic. xii., epistle 12:

"Gregory to Maximinian, Bishop of Syracuse; Concerning the wife of some one that was taken away and sold to another:

"We are told of so many bad things done in that province, that we are led to believe, which may God forbid, the place must soon be destroyed.

"Now, the bearer of these presents complained to us in a pitiable

manner, that many years ago some man whom I know not, belonging to the church of Messina, stood as his sponsor at baptism, and prevailed upon him by extreme urgency to marry his servant, by whom, he says, he has now young children, and whom now this man has violently taken away and sold to another. If this be true, you, our beloved, will see plainly how unheard of and how cruel is the evil. We therefore admonish you to look into and to sift so great a crime, with that earnestness which we assuredly know you have in matters of piety: and should you come to know that the fact is, as the aforesaid bearer has stated, you will be careful not only to bring back to its former state that which was badly done, but you will quickly, by all means, have that punishment inflicted which may appease God. Give a severe lecture to the bishop, that neglected to correct or to amend his people who do such things; setting before him, that if a like complaint comes to us again of any one who belongs to him, canonical process for punishment shall issue, not against the one that shall have done wrong, but against himself."

This will, in conjunction with the other documents, then mark the close of the sixth century as a period when, after the blindness of paganism, the corruption which regarded concubinage with indifference, the impiety which would deprive matrimony of its influence and dignity, and notwithstanding the cruelty which in bad times was used towards the unfortunate slave in this regard, religion at length gave her benign aid to procure that authoritative legislation and a more generous policy should soften the rigours of slavery, and begin to mitigate its evils by giving to this dependant upon his fellow-men the right to the holiest of those bonds by which parents and children were bound by the ties of religion, of nature, and of affection. We may therefore regard this as the period when, after ages of difficulty, the Christian religion had vindicated for the slave this common right of secure marriage, to which nature has given a claim which religion has always recognised. It is true, that though this right is considered inalienable, it is like every other to be regulated by restraints, which, without the destruction or the serious injury of the right itself, may be found necessary for the good of the community.

I have the honour to be, sir
Respectfully, and so forth,
JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 3, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I shall now wind up the examination of this epoch, upon which I have dwelt so long, by adducing a few more of the many documents that exhibit the belief of the Church, in her practice at the period in question, respecting the right to property in slaves.

I have already, in my ninth letter, given the deed which Pope St. Gregory made, conveying a slave to Felix, Bishop of Porto. I shall now give one similar thereto, which is found in Liber II., indic. xi., epistle 18:

"Gregory, to Theodore the Counsellor:

"He, by letter, gives him the boy Acosimus.

"It is fit that they who labour for the benefit of the Church should enjoy a reward from the Church, that they who voluntarily and of their own accord have undertaken burdensome duties should be worthily assisted by our provision. Because therefore, we have known that you, Theodore, our counsellor, a most eloquent man, were not well provided with the service of slaves; we have ordered that a boy, by name Acosimus, of the Sicilian nation, should be given up and delivered to your right and dominion. And as you already have him in your possession by delivery, upon our will, it was necessary to fortify you with the authority of this writing as a testimony to the future and for protection of the gift: so that by God's protection, you may have power to possess him as his lord and master, always securely for ever and without any question being raised of his being in any way taken back. Nor indeed, do we believe that there is any one who would desire or would attempt in any way to revoke so small a bounty given to you for your devotion. Since it would be shameful to undo the good deeds of our predecessors, as it would to teach others that each could from time to time make the revocation of his own gift."

The next document is found in Liber X., indic. v., epistle 40:

Gregory, to the Proctor Bonitus; Concerning the slaves of the Abbot Fortunatus:

"Our son Fortunatus, the Abbot of the monastery of St. Severinus which is in the city of Rome, directing his monks the bearers of these presents to your neighbourhood to gather slaves belonging to the rights of his monastery, who are said to be there in concealment, begged that he should have your aid for that object. Wherefore, we command you,

by this present order, that you would be alert in giving them all reasonable concurrence and aid; so that you being present there and comforting them in this business, they may, with God's aid, be able in a wholesome manner the sooner to perform the duty which has been laid upon them."

Thus, sir, the Pope did not consider it unbecoming in the monastery of St. Severinus to hold slaves, nor irreligious for the Abbot to send monks to bring back runaways, nor criminal for the monks to go looking for them, nor offensive to God, on his own part, to give letters to his officer and overseers to aid by all reasonable means to discover, and to capture them.

The following document appears perhaps to enter into more minute details for the recovery of a slave than you would calculate upon finding in this compilation. It is found in liber VII., ind. ii., epistle 107:

Gregory, to the Proctor Sergius; Concerning Peter, a servant who fled away:

"Our son Occilianus, a highly respectable man, a tribune of the city of Otranto, brought with him to our cousin, as is known, when he was coming to us, a boy named Peter, a baker, who belonged to that cousin. We have now learned that he has run away and returned to your country. Let then it be your care, experienced sir, before he shall be able to get back to Otranto, to direct as quickly as you can, a writing to the Bishop of Otranto, or to the foresaid tribune himself, or to any one else whom you know, that you can depute, to have a good care of the wife or children of the said slave, and be very careful respecting himself, that as soon as he shall arrive he may be detained, and sent with everything that pertains to him, by all means hither, embarking them on board a ship under care of some faithful person.

"You, experienced sir, will therefore exert yourself to do this with all attention and effect, so as not to displease us by a delay or neglect, which we should not desire."

I shall place after this, the following taken from liber VIII., indic. iii., epistle 4:

Gregory to the proctor Fantinus; Concerning the slaves of the honourable man Romanus:

"The slaves of the man of honourable memory, Romanus, who directed that his house in Naples should be formed into a monastery, are said to dwell in Sicily. And as it is known that, with God's help, the monastery has been established according to the regulations of his will; you, experienced sir, will without delay use your best efforts to aid the bearers of these presents who are sent thither to collect those slaves;

and when they shall be collected, let them hire lands under your countenance, where they may labour; keeping them out of their produce of labour whatever may be necessary for their support; let the remainder, under the care of you, experienced sir, be sent, with God's help, every year to the foresaid monastery."

Gregory to Vitalis, proctor of Sardinia; Of buying Barbary slaves: "Know, experienced sir, that Boniface our notary, the bearer of these presents, has been sent by us to your place to purchase some Barbary slaves for the use of the hospital. And therefore, you will be careful to concur diligently and attentively with him that he may buy them at a good rate and such as would be found useful for the service of the hospital. And that having bought them, he may, under the protection of God, very speedily return hither. Do you then be prompt to show yourself in this business so as to exhibit your affection for those who serve the hospital and for whose use the purchase is made, and that they may have it in their power to commend you to us for your zeal in their regard."

The word *parochiæ*, which is translated "hospital," is more properly *ptochia* in some of the ancient MSS., which is a sort of Latinized imitation of πτωχια — a house for feeding the poor. St. Gregory had a large establishment of this description in Rome attended by pious monks, for whose service these barbarians were purchased. Procopius informs us, lib. ii., *De Bello Vandalico*, caput 13, who these Barbary slaves were. When the Vandals had conquered the Moors of Africa, they were annoyed by the incursions of some of the barbarians of the southern part of Numidia. In order to prevent this, they seized upon themselves, their wives and children, and transported them to the island of Sardinia: kept prisoners and slaves for some time here, they escaped to the vicinity of Cagliari, and forming a body of 3000 men, they regained a sort of freedom. St. Gregory made various efforts to convert them. They who were kept in thraldom were frequently purchased, as in this instance, by the Italians and others.

I have now, sir, shown that in the Roman Catholic Church, up to the beginning of the seventh century, though slavery lost many of its harsher and more cruel and repulsive characteristics, the possession, the purchase, the transfer, and the disciplinary rule of slaves, was by no means incompatible with the most perfect piety and sublime practice of religion. This, sir, is domestic slavery, as distinguished from the "slave-trade." We have seen that the violent and rapacious incursions of pirates, who carried off into captivity the defenceless inhabitants of an unsuspecting country, were condemned by the pastors of that church;

and when we shall arrive at the period when Portugal opened the way, and gave origin to the modern slave-trade, we shall see a repetition of the distinction between domestic slavery and the slave-trade, marked in the permission and in the censures of the church.

One of the documents, which to me was the most interesting, in the twelve books of letters which we have from the pen of this holy Pontiff, is in the forty-first of the eleventh book, to the notary Pantaleon, in which he reminds that officer of the solemn oath that he took at the tomb of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, to discharge faithfully the office to which he was appointed, in superintending the Papal patrimony in Syracuse. He then proceeds to applaud the conduct of Pantaleon, who, as Valerius, one of the Pope's secretaries, informed him, broke a measure which he found too large, and which had been used by some of the overseers in measuring the grain which the colonists were required to furnish. He then proceeds to state how the same Valerius informed him that Pantaleon had made a calculation of the amount in which he supposed the overseers had defrauded those servants, and thanks him for it. He then charges him upon his oath, not to have the Holy See a partaker of this fraud; but to give to the poor colonists of each estate, cows, hogs, or sheep, to the amount of the fraud committed by the false measure, and to call to his counsel, for this purpose, the bishop, the local secretary, and the governor, if convenient. He wishes them to determine whether it would be more advisable to make restitution to the colonists in gold or in stock. He concludes by stating that he has enough, and does not want to be thus enriched, and solemnly warns him so to act, as that on the great day of judgment neither of them shall be deprived of their reward by reason of any fraud upon those poor servants; and promises him blessings for himself and for his children, in this world and the next, should he have full justice done to those who have been thus defrauded.

This, sir, is the act of a good and virtuous slaveholder, who feared God and promoted the best interests of religion, who was anxious to do justice and to show mercy to his slaves. This, sir, was one of the greatest Popes that occupied the chair of St. Peter, a slaveholder whom the church venerates as one of her brightest examples of sanctity; a saint, in honour of whom the present venerated Pontiff selected the name which he bears, one who was well acquainted with his history, having studied it in the very monastery that he founded in the city of Rome, and over which the same Gregory XVI. presided, this latter was capable of distinguishing his sainted patron, a holder of slaves in domestic ser-

vitude, from the heartless and unjust man-stealer who makes the slave-trade his pursuit.

In the seventh book of his Epistles, we find that marked 114, addressed to Brunichild, Queen of the Franks, and that numbered 115, to Theodoric and Theodobert, Kings of the Franks, in which, amongst other requests, he entreats that they would prevent the Christians being held in slavery by the Jews. This was perhaps at the time required by the circumstances of the place and of the period, but certainly at the present time in this place, I know of no owners who treat their Catholic slaves with more kindness and affection, or who give them better opportunities for the practice of their religious duties, than do the Jewish owners. I have frequently found Catholic owners, who, in this latter respect, are far behind the Jews, and who, instead of giving to their servants good example and facilities and encouragement to be good Christians, faithful to their God and to their consciences, and conforming to the laws of the church, are the worst obstacles to their salvation.

In the fifth book of Epistles, Ep. 36, to Columbus, Bishop of Numidia, he complains grievously of the crime of those who allowed their children or their slaves to be baptized by the Donatist heretics,—and desires that any who should thereafter be guilty thereof should be excommunicated.

In his sixth book, Ep. 21, he commands the priest Candidus, who was his agent in Gaul, to purchase four of the brothers of one Dominic, who complained to him that they were redeemed from their captors by Jews in Narbonne, and held by them in slavery.

Book third, epistle 28, is a letter to Candidus, ordering a yearly pension to Albinus, a blind son of Martin, one of the colonists.

The seventh book, epistle 22, to John, the Bishop of Syracuse, is a very curious document. It recites the case of one Felix, who was, it would seem, a slave born of Christian parents, and given in his youth as a present to a Jew by a Christian owner; he served illegally during nineteen years the Jew, who was disqualified from holding a Christian slave: but Maximinian, the former Bishop of Syracuse, learning the facts, had, as in duty bound, Felix discharged from this service and made free. Five years subsequently, a son of the Jew became, or pretended to become, a Christian; and being thus qualified to hold a Christian slave, claimed Felix as his property. Felix appealed to the Pope, and the letter to the Bishop of Syracuse is a decision in favour of his freedom, containing also an order to the Bishop to protect him and defend his liberty.

I believe I may now safely dismiss Pope St. Gregory, and pass over

a mass of testimony on the subject, at least twice as large as that which I have adduced. He died in the year 604 of the Christian era: and thus we can perceive what was, during these six first ages of the church, the doctrine and discipline regarding slavery.

I shall now, sir, proceed with more celerity through several documents for subsequent ages.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XIV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 11, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—Soon after the death of the holy Pope St. Gregory the Great, from whose writings I have made such copious extracts, an occurrence took place, which, though it had no immediate bearing on the condition of slavery, yet, in its consequences through successive centuries, had a powerful and extensive influence upon that state. This was the innovation of Mahomet in Arabia. We shall, however, have to review many canons and other documents, before we shall have the Saracen or the Turk upon the field.

At the period to which we have arrived, the Lombards had the principal dominion in Italy; the Franks had obtained possession of the greater portion of ancient Gaul; the Goths had the dominion of Spain; Portugal was become an inheritance for the Suevi; Germany and the northern regions were filled by various hordes, who, under several chiefs, were showing the first symptoms of civilization. England, under its heptarchy, was imbibing from Augustine, the legate of St. Gregory, the religion which she for so many subsequent ages preserved; as yet her common law had not even its foundations laid; and centuries were to elapse before Runnymede was to witness the delivery of Magna Charta: in the course of these times, her Alfred and her Edward the Confessor were to appear. Wales contained the ancient British, who had given way to the Anglo-Saxon; the Pict and the Scot occupied the northern plains and the snow-capped mountains; whilst Erin, with her Milesian progeny, cultivated literature and religion, as yet unassailed by the piratical Dane; Phocus wielded the sceptre of the East; Chosroes II., of the Parthian dynasty, reigned in Persia, and Mahomet had as yet scarcely retired to concoct his mighty imposture in the cave of

Hira: the Visigoth, the Vandal, and the Moor spread themselves over the northern shores of Africa.

Look where you may, sir, through this map, the stain of slavery was upon every spot, and yet Christianity had already had six centuries of existence, and was, more or less powerfully, in possession of this wide domain. She had proclaimed mercy and charity, she had pronounced censures against the piratical invader, she had denounced the manstealer, she had inculcated obedience as the duty of the slave, kindness and protection as the obligation of the owner and she had legislated for the direction of both. Could there be a more clear and unequivocal recognition of the lawfulness of holding property in the domestic slave? I now proceed with the history of ecclesiastical legislation on the subject.

In the precept of King Clotaire II., for endowing the Abbey of Corbey, after the grant of the parcels of land therein recited, he adds, *una cum terris domibus, mancipiis, ædificiis, vineis, silvis, pratis, pascuis, farinariis, et cunctis appenditiis*, and so forth.—Together with the lands, houses, slaves, buildings, vineyards, woods, meadows, pastures, granaries, and all appendages.

And the abbey not only possessed the slaves as property, but by the same precept had civil jurisdiction over all its territory and all persons and things thereon, to the exclusion of all other judges. Clotaire II. died in 628.

The fourth Council of Toledo, in 633, in its 59th Canon, by the authority of King Sisenand and his nobles, and so forth, in Spain, restored to liberty any slaves whom the Jews should circumcise; and in the 66th canon, by the same authority, Jews were thenceforth rendered incapable of holding Christian slaves. The 70th and the 71st canons regulated the process regarding the freed persons and colonists of the church, and the latter affixed a penalty of reduction to slavery for some neglect of formal observances useful to preserve the evidence of title for the colonist. The 72d Canon places the freed persons, whether wholly manumitted or only conditioned, when settled under patronage of the church, under the protection of the clergy.

The 73d permits the ordination of persons fully manumitted by laics, but not of those liable to any condition.

The 74th allows the church to manumit worthy slaves belonging to herself, so that they may be ordained priests or deacons, but still keep the property they may acquire, as belonging to the church which manumitted them, and restricts them even in their capacity as witnesses in several instances; and should they violate this condition, declares them suspended.

In the year 650, which was the 6th of King Clovis II., a council was held at Chalons on the Saone, in France, in whose ninth canon we perceive the dawning of that principle which thenceforth was, for a time, gradually to increase. The canon begins with the announcement of the principle:

"It is a work of the greatest piety, and the intent of religion, that the bond of captivity should be entirely redeemed from Christians. Whence it is known to be the opinion of the holy synod, that no one ought, at all, to sell a slave beyond the dominions of our lord Clovis, the king; lest, which God forbid, Christian slaves should be kept entangled in the chains of captivity, or what is worse, under Jewish bondage."

Thus, sir, after ages of confusion, invasion, civil war, strife, and barbarity, the mild influence of religion had enlightened the minds and began to soften the hearts of that portion of the northern horde that occupied the fertile banks of the southern rivers of the ancient Gauls.

In the tenth Council of Toledo, celebrated in 656, in the reign of Receswind, king of the Goths, the 7th chapter is a bitter complaint of the practice which still prevailed amongst Christians, of selling Christian slaves to the Jews, to the subversion of their faith or their grievous oppression. And the council is the more afflicted at the enormous evil that priests and deacons, led away by avarice, and regardless of spiritual evils, were as deeply involved as lay persons in this criminal abuse. After a long and eloquent exposition of the evils which it produced, and ample quotation from holy writ, it concludes by pronouncing an excommunication, to be incurred by the fact, against all of any grade who shall thenceforth be thus criminal.

In the year 666, a council was held in Merida, in Spain. The 18th canon of which allows that, of the slaves belonging to the church, some may be ordained minor clerks, who shall serve the priests as their masters with due fidelity, receiving only food and raiment.

The twentieth chapter complains of many irregularities in the mode of making freed men for the service of the church, regulates the mode of making them, provides for the preservation of the evidence of their obligation and the security of their service.

The twenty-first regulates the extent to which a bishop shall be allowed to grant gifts to his friends, the slaves, the freed men, or others.

The thirteenth council of Toledo was held in 683, in the reign of Ervigius, the successor of Wamba. There was an old law of the Goths found in lib. v. tit. vii. and repeated in other forms in lib. 10 and 11, regulating that no freed man should do an injury or an unkindness to

his master, and authorizing the master who had suffered, to bring such offender back again to his state of slavery. And in lib. 17, the freed man and his progeny for ever, were prohibited from contracting marriage with the family of their patron or behaving with insolence to them. King Ervigius was reminded by many of his nobles, that former kings, in derogation of this law, had given employments about the palace to slaves and to freed men, and even sustained them in giving offence to their masters, and even sometimes ordered them so to do, and protected them; for this the nobles sought redress. The king called upon the council to unite with him in putting a stop to this indignity. And in the sixth canon we have the detail of the evils set forth, and also the enactment, in concurrence with the king, that thenceforward it shall be unlawful to give any employment whatever about the palace, or in the concerns of the crown, to any freed men or slaves, but to those belonging to the fisc, and punishes the attempt of the slave or freed man who may transgress or offend, with correction, or even reduction to slavery, if he be not a slave.

The third Council of Saragossa was celebrated in the year 691, in the reign of Egica, king of the Goths.

It will be recollected that in previous councils in Spain, especially in some of Toledo, it had been enacted, that any freed man of the church, who did not comply with certain regulations, should lose his freedom and be reduced to slavery. One of the conditions was, that any person pretending to have been manumitted or claiming as the descendant of a freed man, should, upon the death of the bishop, exhibit his papers to the successor of the deceased, within a year, or upon his neglect, should be declared a slave. The object of this was to discern those who were really partially free from the perfect slave, and to cause the former to preserve their muniments.

The fathers of Saragossa, however, discovered that, as they express it, some of the bishops, studying their own gain, had been too rigid in enforcing this law, and thereby reduced several negligent or ignorant persons to bondage; in order then to do justice, they enacted in their fourth chapter, that the year within which the documents should be exhibited, should not commence to run until after the new bishop, subsequently to his institution, should have given sufficient notice to those claiming to be but in partial service, to produce their papers.

The sixteenth Council of Toledo, in Spain, was held in the year 693. The fifth chapter of the acts relates to the repairs of churches, and after referring to the ancient canons regulating that when the bishop received the third of the revenue of the parish, he was bound to repair the

church, and determining when a priest may hold two churches, it has the following passage.

"That the church which shall have as many as ten slaves, shall have one priest over it; but that one which shall have less than ten slaves shall be united to other churches."

Though I can scarcely find an instance at this period, where the word *mancipium* is used for land, yet, as the word has frequently been used in that sense, it may possibly be its meaning in this place. The whole tenor, however, of the Spanish canons during the dominion of the Visigoths, exhibits the churches as in possession of slaves equally as of lands, and indeed throughout the centuries that we now examine, land would have been about as valuable without slaves, in Spain, as it would be this day in Georgia.

In the tenth chapter of the acts of the same council, not only was excommunication pronounced against all who should be guilty of high treason against Egica, the king of the Goth nation, but the bishops and clergy united with the nobles (*palatii senioribus*) and the popular representatives in condemning traitors and their progeny to perpetual slavery, (*fisci viribus sub perpetuâ servitute maneant religati*).

It may not be amiss to add to the above a couple of the laws of Ina, king of the West Saxons or Wessex, about the year 692. They were made for the regulation of religion:

"III. If a slave shall do any work on the Lord's day, by order of his master, let him become free, and let the master pay thirty shillings (another copy adds, '*ad Witam,*' as a fine). But, if he went to this work without his master's command, let him be cut with whips, (another copy has '*corium perdat,*' let him lose his skin,) or at least, let him redeem the fear of the scourge by a price. A freeman, if on this day he shall work without the order of his lord, let him be reduced to slavery, or pay sixty shillings. Should a priest be delinquent in this respect, his penalty shall be increased to double."

The sixth regards broils and quarrels. One of the clauses is, that whosoever shall fight in the dwelling of a villain or colonist, shall pay his year's rent or thirty shillings to the villain.

In the eighth, the division of the weregild for the killing of a stranger, between the king and the family of the deceased is fixed, as also the share of an abbot or of an abbess, if either of them had special rights. We have then the following passage:—

"A stranger, paying a yearly rent, is to be rated at 120 shillings, his son at 100. A slave at either 50 or 60, is a fair estimation. Let a

stranger redeem his fear of whipping for 12 shillings. A stranger being in possession of five hydes of land is to be valued at 600 shillings."

The Anglo-Saxons were very much disposed to treat strangers with contempt: their usual phrase for "a stranger was Walea," or Latin, "Wallus." Silvester Giradus, in his *Descriptio Cambriæ*, caput 7.

When the Anglo-Saxons got into possession of the chief part of Britain, the ancient British were called "Walli," or strangers, and hence the place to which they retreated was called Wealas, or Wales, to which the Normans subsequently gave the name of Pays des Galles. The Irish used to call foreigners Gaul. Thus, by the laws of Ina, the Welshman was worth twice as much as a slave, for his Weregild, but if he possessed five hydes of land, he was rated at ten or twelve times the Weregild of the slave. This is in the law xxii. of Ina, in the general compilation, but selecting from the ecclesiastical it is number viii.

The seventeenth Council of Toledo was celebrated in 694, in the reign of the same Egica. A sentence appended to it regards what I should hope had ceased to be a custom long before this period, but was, as I have before observed, enacted at Agde and at Epao, long previous to this. There were twenty-three of these sentences, the fifteenth of which is:

"If any one shall put his own slave to death, without the knowledge of the judge, he shall cleanse himself of the blood by an excommunication of two years."

In the Council of Berghamstead, near Canterbury, held in 697, under Withred, King of Kent, at which Gebmund, Bishop of Rochester, was present, and where a sort of Parliament also assembled and gave a civil sanction to the temporal enactments and penalties of the canons, several regulations were made concerning slaves. The Saxon MS. is the adoption of the canons into the common law of Canterbury, and is entitled *The Judgments of Withred.*

The ninth canon in this collection is the following:

"If any person shall manumit his servant at the altar, let him be free, and capable of enjoying inheritance and weregild, and let it be lawful for him to dwell where he pleases without limit."

The tenth canon is:

"If on the evening preceding Sunday, after the sun has set, or on the evening preceding Monday, after the setting of the sun, a slave shall do any servile work by command of his master, let the master compensate the deed by eighty shillings."

The eleventh:

"If a servant shall have journeyed on these days, let him pay six shillings to his master, or be cut with a whip."

The twelfth:

"If a freeman [shall do so] on a forbidden time, let him be liable to the fine of the pillory: and let the informer have one-half as well of the fine as of the weregild."

The thirteenth:

"If a villain, without the knowledge of his wife, shall have offered anything to the devil, let him be punished by the loss of all his fortune and by the pillory. And if both did so together, let her also lose all her goods and be punished by the pillory."

I need not inform you, sir, that the English *villain* was the *colonist* of the European continent, and that in the *Speculum Saxonicum*, liber 1, article 3, you will find the description of his imperfect liberty as compared with the free man. You will also find it in Du Cange.—*Paganus Pagenses,* and so forth.

The fourteenth:

"If a slave offers to the devil, let him pay six shillings or be whipped."

The fifteenth:

"If any one shall give his slave flesh-meat to eat on a fast-day, let the slave go out free."

The sixteenth:

"If the slave shall eat it of his own motion, let the penalty be either six shillings or a whipping."

After regulating the mode of declaration of swearing and of compurgation, for the king, the bishop, the abbot, the priest, the deacon, the cleric, the stranger, and the king's thane, the twenty-first canon enacts:

'Let the villain deliver himself with four compurgators, with his head bowed down to the altar."

The twenty-third:

"If any person shall accuse a slave of God in his convent, his lord shall purge him with a simple oath, if he shall have received the eucharist. But if he has never come to the eucharist, let him in his oath have a good surety to answer, or let him pay, or give himself up to be whipped."

The slave of God was one belonging to a monastery, of whom there appear to have been a good number in England, at that period, as well as on the continent. The previous canon had legislated for the bishop's dependants as distinguished from the slave of the monastery.

The twenty-fourth canon is:

"If the slave of a lay person shall accuse the slave of a clergyman, or if the slave of a clergyman shall accuse the slave of a layman, let his master purge him by his single oath."

The twenty-sixth canon regulated the punishment of a freeman who was detected carrying away what he had stolen.

The twenty-seventh regulated the punishment of the person who permitted a thievish slave to escape, and respecting the slave himself concluded thus:

"If any one shall slay him, let him pay to his master one half."

In Germany, however, as yet, in most places, paganism prevailed, and human sacrifices were offered. St. Boniface had been sent by the Holy See, to endeavour to reclaim to religion and to civilization the nations of tribes that composed this undefined extent of territory. We find in a letter of Pope Gregory III., written in answer to his request for special instructions about the year 735, the following paragraph:

"You have said that amongst other crimes this was done in those parts, that some of the faithful sold their slaves to pagans to be immolated. Which you should use all your power to correct, nor allow it to be done any more: for it is wickedness and impiety. Impose, then, upon its perpetrators the same penance as for homicide."

This exhibition, sir, brings us over another century of the view which I proposed to take.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XV

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 28, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I proceed with the history of ecclesiastical legislation concerning slaves. My last letter brought us up to the year 735. I shall, however, before proceeding forward, introduce a small portion of an earlier document.

I omitted to introduce in its proper order the testimony of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in the year 690, and in whose capitulary we find the concurrent testimony of the east and of the west, as he was a native of Tarsus, in Cilicia, the city of St. Paul. He dwelt for some years in Rome, and then governed the English Church

for upwards of twenty years. I shall make a few extracts from his canonical regulations:

VII. The Greeks and Romans give clothing to their slaves, and they work, except on the Lord's day. The Greek monks have not slaves, the Romans have."

XVII. "A free man should be married to a free woman."

LXV. "He who, by the command of his master, shall kill a man, shall fast forty days."

The 71st prohibits the intermarriage of those slaves whose owners will prevent their living together.

The 74th regulates that if a free pregnant woman be sold into slavery, the child that she bears shall be free; all subsequently born shall be slaves.

LXXIX. "A father, compelled by necessity, may deliver his son into slavery, without the will of that son."

LXXXIX. "A bishop or an abbot can hold a criminal in slavery, if he have not the price of his redemption."

CXVII. "It is not lawful for any one to take away from a slave the money made by labour."

I shall pass over a number of acts which only renewed or remodelled the provisions that we have previously seen, and I come to the year 752. In this year Pepin, son of Charles Martel, mayor of the place, and father of Charlemagne, got possession of the throne of France, was crowned at Soissons by St. Boniface, Archbishop of Mayence, and thus founded the second dynasty of the French monarchy. One of his earliest acts was to call an assembly of the French nobles and bishops. They met at Vermeria, now called Verberie, in the department of Oise. The prelates held a council, at which twenty-one canons were made, a few of which will exhibit to us the legislation of that period regarding slaves.

Perhaps it may be as well here to observe that about this period it was usual to hold such joint meetings, and it frequently happened that the bishops also profited of their occasion for holding their own councils; hence, when the acts of the general assembly and those of the council were copied, it not infrequently happened that the canons on ecclesiastical affairs were found on the same record with civil and political statutes and regulations. Thus, it not infrequently happened also that civil laws were found on the rolls of canonical proceedings. And, looking at the records of this and the five or six succeeding centuries, the careless or the uninformed reader may be led to conclude that acts which were never treated of in ecclesiastical councils, were

the legislation of the church, and also that lay or mixed assemblies had enacted canons for the regulation of religion. It must, however, be observed that it also frequently happened that the same subject was treated of in each assembly, but under different relations; in the one as it regarded the doctrine or discipline of the church, in the other as it regarded the concerns of the state; and the two enactments were not always separately engrossed. I will not, however, deny that during this period usurpations of power were occasionally attempted on both sides, and not always without success.

In this Council of Verberie, which was held in a palace of King Pepin, the sixth canon made regulations in the case of marriage between free persons and slaves. The following are its provisions.

1. If any free person contracted marriage with a slave, being at the time ignorant of the state of bondage of that party, the marriage was invalid.

2. If a person under bond should have a semblance of freedom by reason of condition, and the free person be ignorant of the bondage, and this bond person should be brought into servitude, the marriage was declared originally void.

3. An exception was made where the bond person, by reason of want, should with the consent of the free party, sell himself or herself into perfect slavery, with the consent of the free party, then the marriage was to stand good, because the free party had consented to the enslavement, and profited of its gains.

The seventh canon would seem to show us that a slave could hold property in slaves; but probably the *servus* there described was a *conditionatus,* or person held to certain services, and not a *mancipium,* or absolute slave.

"If a man-servant shall have his own female slave as a concubine, he shall have power, if he wishes, leaving her, to marry his equal, the female servant of his master: but it is better that he should keep his own servant in wedlock."

The eighth canon provided, in the case of a freedman who, subsequently to his liberation, committed sin with the female slave of his former master, that the master should have power, whether the freedman would or not, to compel him to marry that female slave; and should this man leave her, and attempt marriage with another woman, this latter must be separated from him.

The thirteenth declares that when a freeman, knowing that the woman whom he is about to marry is a slave, or not having known it

until after marriage, voluntarily upon the discovery consents to the marriage, it is henceforth indissoluble.

The nineteenth declares that the separation of married parties, by the sale of one who is a slave, does not affect the marriage. They must be admonished, if they cannot be reunited, to remain continent.

The twentieth provides for the case of a male slave freed by letter (*chartellarius*), who having for his wife taken a slave with the lawful consent of her master, and, leaving her, takes another as his wife. The latter contract is void, and the parties must separate.

Another assembly was held by King Pepin, in Compeigne, forty-eight miles northeast of Paris, where he had a country seat. At this assembly, also, the prelates held a council in 757, and made eighteen canons. The fourth makes provision for the case of a man's giving his free step-daughter—that is, the daughter of his wife by a previous marriage—in wedlock to a freeman or to a slave. The fifth declares void the marriage between a free person and a slave, where the former was ignorant of the condition of the latter. The sixth regards a case of a complicated description, where a freeman got a civil benefice from his lord, and takes his own vassal with him, and dies upon the benefice, leaving after him the vassal. Another freeman becomes invested with the benefice, and, anxious to induce the vassal to remain, gives him a female serf attached to the soil as his wife. Having lived with her for a time, the vassal leaves her, and returns to the lord's family, to which he owed his services, and there he contracts a marriage with one of the same allegiance. His first contract was invalid; the second was the marriage.

In the year 772 a council was held in Bavaria, at a place called Dingolvinga, (which, as far as I can discover by comparison of maps and similarity of name, is the present city of Ingolstadt), in the reign of Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria. The tenth canon of this council decides that a noble woman, who has contracted marriage with a slave, not being aware of his condition, is at liberty to leave him, the contract being void, and she is to be considered free, and not to be reduced to slavery. By *noble* we are here to understand *free*, as distinguished from *ignoble*, that is, a slave.

To understand the full bearing of some parts of this canon, it is necessary to know what the laws of Bavaria at that time regulated concerning free women who married slaves. And we find sufficient for our purpose upon the record of the assembly which was held for the purpose of civil legislation, at the same period that this council was celebrated. It recites, after giving the fourteen canons of this council,

that under the everlasting reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, but in the 22d year of the most religious Tassilo, Duke of Bojoari, on the 11th of the ides of October, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord 772, the tenth indiction, the aforesaid prince held an assembly at Dingolvinga, a public town, where he had gathered his chiefs. And a monastery of men, as also one of females, having been there founded, and the bishops having made their canons, the laws of the nation were revised by the consent of the skilful chiefs and of all the assembly. We have then sixteen amendments of the national law.

The first regulates by the authority of the prince and consent of the whole assembly, that henceforth no slave, whether fugitive or other, should be sold beyond the limits of the territory, under penalty of the payment of his weregild.

In the second, among other things, it is enacted that if a slave should be killed in the commission of house-breaking, his owner is to receive no compensation: and should the felon who is killed in man-stealing, when he could not be taken, whether it be a freeman or a slave that he is carrying off, no weregild shall be paid by the slayer, but he shall be bound to prove his case before a court.

The seventh regards the trial by ordeal of slaves freed by the duke's hand.

The eighth establishes and guards the freedom, not only of themselves, but of their posterity, for those freed in the church, unless when they may be reduced to slavery from inability to pay for damages which they had committed.

The ninth contains, amongst other enactments, those which explain the tenth canon of the council. After specifying different weregilds for freed persons, it says:

"Should a female slave be emancipated by deed or in the church, and afterwards marry a slave, she shall be a slave to the church."

It then continues respecting a woman originally free, and, as I suppose, the *nobilis* of canon x:

"But if a free Bavarian female shall have married a servant of the church, and the maid will not submit to servile work, she may depart."

I suppose from the subsequent portion of the law, as well as from the Christian doctrine of the indissolubility of a perfect marriage, that in this case there was merely a contract, not followed by its consummation; for the law proceeds:

"But if she shall have there born sons and daughters, they shall continue slaves, and not have power of going forth."

Her freedom was not, however, immediately destroyed, for the law proceeds:

"But she, their mother, when she may desire to go forth before three years, shall have free power therefor."

In this case the marriage subsisted, but the free woman could separate without, however, the marriage bond being rent. If she remained beyond the time of three years, she lost her freedom; and it shows us that, probably previous to this amendment, any free woman who married a slave, thereby lost her freedom; and that the tenth canon, showing the marriage of which it treated to be invalid, showed that the woman should not lose her liberty. The concluding provision of the ninth law is as follows:

"But if she shall have continued three years doing the work of a slave, and her relations have not brought her out so that she should be free, either before the count, or the duke, or the king, or in the public high court (mall), when the kalends of March shall have thrice passed, after this she shall remain perpetually a slave, and they who shall be born of her, male and female, shall be slaves,"

In 768 Charlemagne succeeded Pepin in the rule of one portion of his dominions, and three years afterwards, upon the death of his brother Carloman, he succeeded to the remainder. This is not the place to give his history, but I merely remark that in the collection of canon law taken from the various councils for the preceding centuries, and then in force, which was delivered to him by Pope Adrian I., in the year 774, we find nearly all those which I have previously adverted to, or quoted, respecting slaves. I shall instance a few: the 3d of Gangræ, condemning as guilty of heresy those who taught that religion sanctioned the slave in despising his master; the 30th in the African collection, which showed that the power of manumission in the church was derived from the civil authority: the 102d of the same, which declared slaves and freed persons disqualified to prosecute, except in certain cases and for injuries done to themselves.

In the capitulary of Charlemagne, published in such a synod and general assembly in 779, in the month of March, in the eleventh year of his reign, at Duren, on the Roer (Villa Duria), between Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle, there being assembled *episcopis, abbatibus, virisque illustribus comitibus, unâ cum piissimo domino nostro*,—"the bishops, abbots, and the illustrious men, the counts, together with our most pious lord, we find the following chapter."

XX. "Concerning slaves that are sold, let it be in the presence of the bishop, or of the count, or in the presence of the archdeacon,

or of the judge of the hundred, or in presence of the lord's deputy, or of the judge of the county, or of well-known witnesses. And let no one sell a slave beyond the boundary. Whosoever shall do so, shall pay as many fines as he sold slaves. And if he has not the money, let him deliver himself to the count in pledge as a slave until he shall pay the fines."

The bishops and the abbots were concurring parties to this chapter, and Charlemagne was a good practical religious man.

In the capitulary of Pope Adrian I., containing the summary of the chief part of the canon law then in force as collected from the ancient councils and other sources, delivered to Ingilram, Bishop of Metz, or, as it was then called Divodurum, or oppodum Mediomatricorum, on the 19th of September, xiii. kalendas Octobris, indic. ix., 785. The sixteenth chapter, describing those who cannot be witnesses against priests, mentions not merely slaves, but *quorum vitæ libertas nescitur*, "those who are not known to be free;" and in the notes of Anthony Augustus, Bishop of Tarragona, on this capitulary, he refers for this and another passage, *viles persona*—"persons of vile condition," which is the appellation of slaves, to decrees of the earliest of Popes, viz., Anacletus, A. D. 91, and Clement, his immediate successor; Evaristus, who was the next, and died A. D. 109; Pius, who died A. D. 157; Calistus, in 222; Fabian, 250; and several others. In chapter xxi., among incompetent witnesses, are recited, *nullus servus, nullus libertus*—"no slave, no freedman." The notes of the same author inform us that this portion of the chapter is the copy of an extract from the first Council of Nice, and that it is also substantially found in a passage from Pope Pontianus, who died in 235, as well in several of the early African and Spanish councils which he quotes.

I have already noticed the collection of canon law given by Pope Adrian to Charlemagne. That monarch having the best possible understanding with the Holy See, animated by an ardent zeal for the progress and the establishment of morality, was also one of the most active and indefatigable princes, a profound statesman, and a skilful and successful general.

He assembled many councils of prelates, nobles, and other advisers, having all the topics on which he determined to legislate maturely discussed by each order of persons, in its proper place, he embodied into enactments, called Capitularies, the legislative results. We have several of these; a large portion of them are chapters, or *capita*, making the canons and the decisions which he received from the Pope, the law of the kingdom, and subsequently, when he had been crowned emperor,

the law of the empire. In most of the chapters, reference is made to the council which enacted the provision, and to the canon in which the enactment is found, and frequently the very words of the canon are used. It was thus that a large portion of the canon law became the public law of the greater part of Europe, by civil legislation, and not by papal encroachment; and it exhibits either very imperfect knowledge or great dishonesty in a great number of writers upon law, especially the English and American schools, when at this day they continue to retail the falsehoods and calumnies of earlier historians, who, to subserve the purposes of innovators, have falsified history.

I am, indeed, disposed to make great allowance for the American writers, not one in twenty of whom, perhaps, ever laid his eye upon one of the documents of which I treat, and who takes for granted all that an English jurist or a European infidel writes upon the subject.

One of these assemblies in which Charlemagne published a capitulary, was held at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aquisgranum) in 789, in which eighty-two chapters were enacted. Number xxiii. is founded upon canon iv. of the council of Chalcedon, and upon an enactment of Leo the Great, the latter of which I have given in Letter VI., on the 4th of November. It prohibited all attempts to induce a slave to embrace either the clerical or monastical state, without the will and license of the master. Number xlv. prohibits, amongst others, slaves from being competent witnesses, or freedmen against their patrons; founded upon the 96th canon of African councils, quoted in Letter V., October 28th. Number lvii., referring to the 3d canon of the Council of Gangræ, mentioned also in Letter V., prohibits bishops ordaining slaves without the master's license.

In 794 a council was held at Frankfort-on-the-Main, at which the bishops of a large portion of Europe assisted, the 23d canon of which is the following:

"Of servants belonging to others: they shall be received by no one, nor admitted to orders by bishops, without their master's license."

In the year 697, at another assembly held at Aix-la-Chapelle, the capitulary for the pacification and government of Saxony was enacted by Charlemagne. The eighth chapter is:

"If any person shall sacrifice a man to the devil, and offer him as a victim to devils after the fashion of pagans, he shall be put to death."

I beg, for an explanation of this, to refer to the concluding part of Letter XIV., February 11th, where Pope Gregory III. answers St. Boniface, who informed him that unfortunate slaves were bought to be thus immolated.

XI. "If any one shall do violence to his master's daughter, he shall be put to death."

XII. "If any one shall kill his master or his mistress, he shall be punished in like manner."

XIV. "All agreed concerning the smaller congregations, that the colonists frequenting each church should bestow upon it one dwelling, with proper out offices, and two manses of land; and that they should give to the same church one male slave and one female slave between one hundred and twenty noble and free men, and counting also the conditioned servants."

Thus in this newly settled ecclesiastical province the provision made for the support of religion consisted of land and slaves; and the *liti*, or servants under condition, were to be counted as freemen in taking the census. The *mansa* was generally as much good land as could be tilled by a servile family and a pair of oxen, and was computed to be about twelve acres.

I had hoped in this letter to make progress through a large number of years, but I find the documents before me too numerous to press into the space that remains. I shall reserve them for my next.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XVI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 31, 1841.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—I proceed with the capitularies of Charlemagne. He was crowned Emperor of the Romans on Christmas day, in the year 800, by Pope Leo III., at High Mass, in the church of the Vatican, before the confession of St. Peter, or the tomb where one-half of the body of that blessed apostle is laid up, together with one-half of that of St. Paul:—and thus was the Western empire re-established.

The Lombards had long disturbed Italy. Charlemagne succeeded in reducing them to better order, and in the year 801, he, by a capitulary, amended their laws. I shall exhibit one chapter by which the colonial state of Italy was assimilated to that of France and of Germany:

VI. "*Of the public Aldions, belonging to the public estate*: The Aldions, or Aldians, shall, in Italy, exist upon the same principle in the service of their masters that the fiscals and lids do exist in France."

The Aldions were bondsmen or bondswomen, whose persons were not at the disposal of their masters, nor did they pass with the land as colonists did, but their masters or patrons had certain claims upon stated services from them. They were generally either freed persons or the descendants of those who had been manumitted upon the condition of performing stipulated services, and if they failed to perform these they were liable to be reduced to slavery. The fisc was originally a basket or frail, into which the common property was put; it was then a bag or sack, for holding money, and lastly came to mean the treasury, and by common use to be generally confined to the State Treasury or monarch's treasury; hence the *fiscalini* or *fiscal servants* were, in France, persons who owed certain fixed services to the *fisc* or treasury of the monarch, of the state, or of some community, or church, or public body. The *Lidus* or *Liddus*, or *litus* of the Saxon was so called from being spared in the conquest, and left on the land with the obligation of paying the master, who owned it and himself, a certain portion of its produce, and doing him other fixed services. Thus neither of them was an absolute slave whose person and property were at the owner's disposal. The slave was manumitted, but this latter description of servants were generally released by deed or charter: hence, when so freed they were called *chartulani*, *chartellani*, or "chartered." The transition from slavery to this latter kind of servitude was at the commencement of the ninth century greatly on the increase.

VIII. "*Concerning runaway slaves*: Wheresoever within the bounds of Italy, either the runaway slave of the king or of the church, or of any other man, shall be found by his master, he shall be restored without any bar of prescription of years; yet upon the provision that the master be a Frank or a German or of any other nation (foreign). But if he be a Lombard or a Roman, he shall acquire or receive his slaves by that law which has been established from ancient times amongst them."

Here again is abundant evidence of the prevalent usage of the church holding property in slaves; just as commonly as did the king or any other person.

In the year 805, Charlemagne published a capitulary at Thionville, in the department of Moselle, France, (Theodonis villa.) In the chapter xi. we read:

"*Concerning their own male or female slaves.* Let not an excessive number of their own male or female slaves be taken into the monasteries, lest the farms be deserted."

This capitulary regards principally the regulation of monasteries.

St. Pachomius, who was born in Upper Egypt, in 292, and who was the first that drew up a regular monastic rule, would never admit a slave into a monastery.—Tillemont, vii. page 180.

In the year 813, a council was held at Chalons, on the Saone, in France, the portions of whose enactments in any way affecting property or civil rights were confirmed by Charlemagne and made a portion of the law of the empire.

Many of the churches, especially in the country, were curtailed in their income and reduced to difficulties, because the bishops and abbots had large estates within their parishes, and many servants occupied in their cultivation, and the prelates prevented the servants paying tithes to the parish clergy, claiming for themselves an exemption from the obligation. The canon xix. is the following:—

"Moreover some brethren have complained, that there were some bishops and abbots who would not permit tithes to be given to those churches where colonists hear mass. Wherefore that holy assembly decreed, that, for those fields and vineyards which they have for their own support or that of their brethren, the bishops and abbots should cause the tithe to be paid to the churches. And let the servants pay their tithes to the church where their infants are baptized and where during the year, they hear mass."

In this we have additional evidence, if it were wanted, of the fact that large bodies of land and numerous servants attached to them were held by bishops and abbots, not only for themselves, but for their churches and their monasteries. The canon xxx. is the following:—

"It has been stated to us that some persons, by a sort of magisterial presumption, dissolve the lawful marriages of slaves; not regarding that evangelical maxim, *What God hath put together, let man not separate.* Whence it appears to us, that the wedlock of slaves may not be dissolved even though they have different masters; but let them serve their masters remaining in one wedlock. And this is to be observed with regard to those where there has been a lawful union, and with the will of the owners."

Charlemagne died in the year 814, and was succeeded in the empire by Louis the Weak, or the Pious. In the third year of his reign, in the year 816, a council was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, in which a large portion of the canon law then in force regarding the clergy was embodied into 145 chapters. After the session of the council, the emperor published a capitulary containing thirty chapters: the sixth of which complains of the continued indiscretion of bishops in ordaining servants, contrary to the canons, and forbids such ordinations except upon the

master's giving full liberty to the slave: declares also, that if a servant shall impose upon a bishop by false witnesses or documents of freedom, and thus procure ordination, he shall be deposed and taken back by his owner. If the descendant of a slave who came from abroad, shall have been educated and ordained, where there was no knowledge of his condition, should his owner subsequently discover him and prove his property, if this owner grants him liberty he may keep his clerical rank; but if the master asserts his right and carries him away, though the slave does not lose his character of order, he loses his rank and cannot officiate. Should masters give servants freedom that they may be capable of ordination, it shall be in the masters' discretion to give or to withhold the property necessary to enable the person to get orders.

The archbishops are to have in each province the emperor's authority in the original, to authorize their ordaining the servants of the church, and the suffragan bishops are to have copies of the original, and when such servant is to be ordained, this authority must be read for the people from the pulpit or at the corner of the altar. The like form was to be observed when any of the laity desired to have any servant of the church promoted to orders, or when the like promotion was petitioned for by the prior of a chapter or of a monastery. This emperor died in 840, and Lotharius, his son, had the title of emperor. He published a capitulary in Rome, in 842.

In the third chapter of the first part, we find the following expression:—

"Let no one, whether freeman or slave, presume to create any impediment in the election of the Roman Pontiff."

Which leads us to suspect that some slaves possessed considerable power or influence.

The second part consists of a portion enacted at a different period, but engrossed with that which I have noticed.

In the second chapter, fines are imposed for creating riots in any church. And the chapter concludes in the following words:

"And let him who has not the means of paying the church, give himself in servitude to that same church until he pays the whole debt."

By the tenth chapter he restrained the power of manumission.

"That a slave whose father or whose mother was a slave cannot become free before thirty years of age. We order that the same shall be the case respecting Aldions."

In the twelfth, he states that these are but a continuance of the laws of his grandfather Charles, and of his father Louis. And in Tit. i., 12 of Ulpian, reference is made to a variety of enactments of the ancient

Roman law, that a slave manumitted under the age of thirty could not be a Roman citizen, except by a special grant of a court.

The thirteenth declares that free women who unite with their own slaves are in the royal power, and are given up, together with their children, to slavery amongst the Lombards.

The fourteenth enacts, that a free woman who shall unite herself to the male slave of another, and remain so for a year and a day, shall, together with her children, become enslaved to her husband's owner.

The fifteenth regulates, that if the free husband of a free woman shall, for crime or debt, bring himself into servitude to another, and she not consent to remain with him, the children are free; but if she die, and another free woman, knowing his condition, marries him, the children of this latter shall be slaves.

A number of chapters are also on these records, showing the insufficiency of servile testimony. Others provide against the oppression of poor freemen, so that they shall not be easily compelled to sell themselves into slavery.

About the year 860, Pope Nicholas I. sent to the newly converted Christians of Bulgaria answers to several inquiries which they made for the regulation of their conduct. The 97th regards slaves who accuse their masters to the prince or to the court; and the Pope refers them to the obligation of their master, as given in chapter vi. of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians; not to use threatenings towards their servants, and then asks, how much more strongly does the spirit of this maxim of kindness and affection bear upon the servant, and teach him to be of an humble and forgiving disposition, such as that chapter enjoins; referring also to the direction of our Saviour (*Luke* vi. 37), and the injunction of the Apostle (*I Thess.* v. 15), for their direction.

I may, perhaps, here close that part of my observations which were intended to show, that by Scripture and by tradition we discover that the existence of domestic slavery is perfectly compatible with the practice of true religion.

In the Scriptural evidence, we have seen the laws regarding it, made for his chosen people by God himself. We have found that, amongst the various crimes denounced by the Saviour, he never directly or indirectly either mentions or alludes to this,—yet he not only was fully aware of its existence, but it was alluded to and spoken of by slaveholders, upon whom he conferred great favours, and to whose high virtues he bore ample testimony.

His apostles distinctly show their respective duties to the slave-

holder and to the slave, who are both members of the church of Jesus Christ; and strongly as they recommend kindness and mercy to one, they inculcate obedience and humility upon the other.

Tradition is the preservation of the original doctrine. It is evinced by a variety of testimony, consisting of documents, of usages, of legislation, of practice, of preaching, and so on. I have, for nearly the first nine centuries of the Christian era, that is, for the earlier half of that period which has elapsed from the establishment of the Christian religion, shown all this variety of testimony, exhibiting the unchanging doctrine on this subject, preserved under a variety of circumstances in all those regions that had received the light of the Gospel.

This, I repeat, is what we call tradition. And of what does that body of evidence consist? Of the admonitions of the earliest and the holiest pastors of the church; of the decrees of her councils, repeatedly made upon a variety of occasions; of the synodical condemnation of those who, under the pretext of religion, would teach the slave to despise his master; of the prohibition to her prelates to interfere with the slave property of any one, without his full permission, for the purpose of ordination, or of monastic profession; of the sanction and support of those laws by which the civil power sought to preserve the rights of the owner; of the deeds of gift or of sale by which the church acquired such property for the cultivation of her lands, for the support of her temples, for the maintenance of her clergy, for the benefit of her monasteries, of her hospitals, of her orphans, and of her other works of charity. All this testified that she continued to regard the possession of such property as being fully compatible with the doctrine of the Gospel that she was commissioned to proclaim. And whilst she denounced the pirates who made incursions to reduce to bondage those who were free and unoffending, whilst she regarded with just execration the persons who fitted out ships and hired men to engage in such a traffic as is known now by the expression "slave-trade"—she found domestic slavery existing throughout her jurisdiction, and mixed up with almost all her transactions during those centuries from whose records I have quoted so sparingly, though perhaps so tediously, to form an outline of my argument of tradition. Thus, by the testimony of the church, and not by our own conjectures, we learn that doctrine which was originally delivered by God, and then handed down, without alteration, through successive generations.

I now draw your attention to the influence that Mahometanism had upon slavery. In the East, the first Arabian warriors who marched as the propagators of Islamism, offered to those whom they assailed

the alternative of embracing their religion, or paying them tribute, or taking the chances of war. Persia and Syria were quickly under their yoke. About the year 645 Egypt fell into their hands, and the conquest of Cyprus was not long delayed. In all those places, the slaves of Jews and of Christians were admitted to their freedom upon declaring themselves believers in the doctrines of the Koran; and we can easily conceive that in this way great numbers obtained their emancipation. On the other hand, many of those who were made captives in war were reduced to slavery,—so that it is not improbable that the accounts may be, at the least, balanced.

There was, however, a serious difference between the position of the slave under the caprice of a barbarian flushed with victory, and taught to consider his servant as an infidel dog,—and of one who professed the same religion as his master, and that master taught that at the tribunal of their common God he should account most fully for every injustice or unkindness done to his slave. Nor was this the only restraint imposed upon him. We have seen how, by the canons of the church and the laws of the land, there was ample protection afforded the weaker party. If to this we add the heavy tribute imposed upon the Christian, and his perpetual liability to insult and injustice, the slave of such a slave must himself be in a worse position than if the owner had been in his former freedom.

I am well aware that some of the writers on history, upon whom it is fashionable to rely, give us glowing descriptions of the noble qualities of the Saracens, and delight to dwell upon the superiority of the polished Mussulman over the rude and superstitious Gothic Christians of this age. Mr. Gibbon is as eloquent as he is imaginative upon the theme. It suited his object, and was naturally to be expected from the writer, whose aim was to destroy Christianity by drawing it into contempt. But, fortunately, whosoever will calmly investigate facts, instead of being content with partial, discoloured, and deceptive statements, will soon detect the fraud. I have no difficulty in concluding, even after a limited view, that the progress of the Saracen did much to perpetuate and to extend slavery, and to render the situation of its victims much worse than it was at the period of the Hegira.

Sicily was the next foothold of the Saracens, and their first resting-place in Europe, in 655. They threatened Constantinople and Italy, and before the close of the seventh century the Vandal, the Visigoth, and the Moor were subjected to their yoke along the whole range of northern Africa. You, sir, cannot be ignorant of their descent upon Spain, and of their success in the beginning of the next century, when

the throne of Roderic was overturned. It may be permitted to me, sir, in this place to give a sketch of the mildness, the magnanimity, and the generosity of this favourite people of the author of the Decline and Fall. I shall merely give an outline of the clemency shown to a country which had submitted to the conquerors' yoke. I translate it from Fleury, liber xli., paragraph 25, who refers to authorities of the highest description, by whom he is amply sustained. Toledo was quietly given up to Mousa, the governor of Africa, as vicar to the caliph, "who put the chief men to death, and subjected all Spain as far as Saragossa, which he found open. He burned the towns, he had the most powerful citizens crucified, he cut the throats of the children and of the infants, and spread terror on every side." I should suppose that the precepts of St. Paul, to treat the Christian slaves with kindness, and to forbear threatenings, would produce little effect upon the gentle Saracen!

Sardinia next fell into their power, and they avowed that their object was to seize upon the Vatican, and to allow to the head of the Christians, and to the body over which he presided, as little power as they could, and for as short a space of time as possible.

A few of the Spaniards had taken refuge in the mountains of Asturia, and chose Pelagius, son of Fasila, of the royal family of the Goths, for their prince. Attacked in their place of retreat, this remnant of the Christians defended themselves with valour, and kept their borders free. In the East, the Christians suffered dreadful persecution, —and they who escaped death, and would not apostatize, suffered worse than slavery.

In 719, crossing the Pyrenees, the Mahometans poured themselves upon the south of France. After two years of ravages, Zama, their chief, was compelled, by Eude, Duke of Aquintaine, to raise the siege of Toulouse, he was slain and his troops driven back; but their incursions were repeated and it is stated by the historians of the time that in one action they lost 375,000 men. It was in an action with them, between Tours and Poictiers, that Charles, the father of Pepin, uniting his forces with those of Eude, gave them a signal defeat, and got the surname of Martel, from the hammering by which he spread such destruction through their host. Though the French church suffered greatly from their ravages yet the warriors prevented their carrying off many slaves.

The Christians were allowed to practise their religion in the subjugated portion of Spain, with great restrictions, and upon payment of heavy tribute. Alphonsus the Catholic succeeded Fasila, the son of Pelagius, in 740, and, finding the Mussulman weakened by his losses

in France, struck a blow for the liberation of Spain, and recovered a considerable number of towns, releasing tens of thousands of Christians from their bondage.

About fifty years later, Alphonsus the Chaste conquered a large portion of the Peninsula, and kept up an intercourse with Charlemagne, to whom, upon the conquest of Lisbon, in 798, he sent, amongst other presents, seven Moorish slaves.

In 842, the Moorish Mussulmen entered the Rhone, ravaged the south of France, near Arles, and carried off a large booty and several persons into slavery. And here we may fix the origin of that piracy which our government and the governments of Great Britain and France have so lately succeeded in completely destroying, after a duration of about one thousand years.

Italy also was, by the dispute of two chieftains for the possession of Benevento, laid open to them. Radelgise called to his aid the Moors of Africa, and Siconulph those of Spain, both parties accepted the invitations, and each returned with a large booty and many captives. In 846, a Moorish band entered the Tiber, sacked the vicinage of Rome, took Fondi, caried off booty and prisoners, scoured the country south to Gaeta, and defeated a body of French troops sent to capture them. They did not re-embark until the following April, when they were lost in a storm. A number of those who came to Benevento continued in its vicinity, making occasional predatory incursions.

In 849, a company of Moors from Africa came to rendezvous at Tozar, in Sardinia, thence to make an incursion by the Tiber upon Rome. A fleet was fitted out at Naples, Amalfi, and Gaeta to intercept them; this expedition anchored at Ostia, where the Pope visited them, celebrated mass, and gave them communion, and returned to Rome. Next day the Moors hove in sight. The Neapolitans went out to meet them, and made a well-directed assault. The fleets were, however, separated by a storm, in which the chief part of the Moorish vessels were wrecked. Of those Saracens who got safe to the shore, several were killed in fight, some were hanged, and a large number were brought to Rome, where they were kept enslaved at the public works, and particularly on the walls which were now being built to enclose the Vatican and the church of St. Peter within the city, as this place, having previously been without walls, had been plundered by the Moors in their piratical incursions in 846.

I have noticed these acts of the Saracens, as I shall the similar ones of the Northmen or Danes, in order to show why, though great efforts were made by many benevolent persons to abolish slavery or to mitigate

its evils, those efforts were unsuccessful. I also desire, in giving this brief outline, to exhibit the clear distinction between domestic slavery and the slave-trade, and to show that, whilst the church tolerated the one, she always condemned the other.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XVII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 8, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—The Christian religion had, in the eighth century, spread through a considerable portion of that territory now known as Germany, and had succeeded in mitigating the evils of slavery in the places where it had its due influence. Scandinavia, whose western boundary was the Atlantic or German Ocean, lay on both sides of that gulf, called, in the phrase of the writers of the ninth and tenth centuries, Mare Balticum and Mare Barbarum, both known in previous ages as the Sinus Codanus, and now as the Baltic Sea, the Gulf of Bothnia, and the Gulf of Finland. Its western boundary was that region, of then undefined extent and character, called Sarmatia. Generally, Scandinavia may be said to comprise Denmark, Norway, and Sweden of the present day. The Cimbri who occupied the present portion of Denmark known as Jutland, were, I may say, the only portion of the Scandinavian race that was beginning to be known in the days of Charles Martel. Accustomed to the stormy sea that raged and foamed about their coasts, this race of barbarians ventured to a distance in vessels of no mighty, formidable size, and in the middle of the eighth century, beginning to find their cold and barren regions fully stocked with inhabitants, ventured upon voyages of discovery. Scotland, as being the most convenient, was first troubled with their visits; and, about the year 790, they made a descent upon Ireland, in the reign of Doonchad or Donagh, the successor of Niel Frassach. Their incursion was made upon the small island of Rechran or Ragulin, which they laid waste, in 797. According to the Ulster Annals, they plundered and devastated Innis Patrick, now called Holm Patrick, carrying away several captives, among whom was a sister of St. Findan:—some time afterwards, he was himself made captive by another party of marauders, but he concealed himself in a cavern of a rock on one of the Orkney Islands, where they stopped; and, after their departure, making his way to Scotland, he was able

to return home. He was subsequently one of the first monks of the monastery of Rhingaw, in the Duchy of Nassau, and near which he was for many years a recluse. After his death and the belief of his salvation, he was chosen patron of that monastery.

In 793, or the fifth year of Ethelred or Ethelbert, on the 7th of June, they commenced the plunder of the fine abbey of Lindisfarne. The following is extracted from Lingard's History of the Anglo-Saxon Church:

In the year 793, the inhabitants of Northumbria were alarmeed by the appearance of a Danish armament near the coast. The barbarians were permitted to land without opposition. The plunder of the churches exceeded their most sanguine expectations: and their route was marked by the mangled carcases of the nuns, the monks, and the priests, whom they had massacred. But historians have scarcely condescended to notice the misfortunes of other churches: their attention has been absorbed by the fate of Lindisfarne. That venerable pile, once honoured by the residence of the Apostle of Northumbria, and sanctified by the remains of St. Cuthbert, became the prey of the barbarians. Their impiety polluted the altars, and their rapacity was rewarded by its gold and silver ornaments, the oblations of gratitude and devotion. The monks endeavoured, by concealment, to elude their cruelty; but the greater number were discovered; and were either slaughtered on the island, or drowned in the sea. If the lives of the children were spared, their fate was probably more severe than that of their teachers; they were carried into captivity."

We find, also, that Charlemagne, in the month of March, 800, visited the German coast, to have proper precautions taken against the incursions and ravages of the Northmen or Danes, who had already plundered several places and carried off captives.

In 802, they made another incursion on Ireland and burned the famous monastery of Hy, and repeated their visit four years after, in 807, penetrating as far as Roscommon; they destroyed the town and ravaged the country, carrying off several captives; but in 812, the Irish made a determined resistance, and after three signal defeats, the Northmen escaped from the island.

This, however, was but a short respite; for, in five years afterwards, the Norwegian Turgesius brought with him an immense force, with which he overran a large portion of the island; his arrival was in 835, but during the twelve previous years, Cork, Lismore, Armagh, Monaghan, Louth, and several other cities and towns, together with their territories, were plundered by those idolaters; the greater por-

tion of their clergy, and monks, and nuns were massacred, many of the inhabitants taken into captivity, and several of the most pious and learned men migrated to the continent, where several of them were elevated to bishopries, others placed at the head of monasteries, and not a few were employed in the professorships of universities then beginning to be founded.

The horde that accompanied Turgesius was the most numerous and the most savage that had yet appeared; and, within three years, it had nearly overrun Connaught, Leinster, and Ulster. Two large additional fleets brought an immense accession of the savages in 837; one of them entered the river Boyne and the other came up the Liffey; the masses which they poured upon the country, spread in all directions over its surface, committing every kind of excess.

We have a curious exhibition in 848, after Emly had been destroyed by the Northmen: Olchobair Mackinede, who had been abbot of that see, was made King of Munster, and uniting his troops with those of Dorcan, King of Leinster, was seen leading the armies to victory over the pagans. The Archbishop of Armagh, Forannan, who was primate of all Ireland, was, however, in the same year, made captive by Turgesius, who sent him, his clergy, and the church furniture, with about seven hundred other captives, to Limerick, to be carried into slavery. Melseachlin, King of Ireland, sent ambassadors to make a treaty with Charles the Bald, who then was the successor of Charlemagne upon the throne of France, and who was also harassed by the Scandinavians. Turgesius was defeated by the Irish monarch, made captive, and drowned: the Irish rose on every side upon their oppressors, and nearly drove the barbarians from the country.

The English heptarchy, at this time, suffered equally as did Ireland, and with less intermission.

In 850, Dublin was invaded by a large body of Northmen, whom the Irish denominated Fin-gâl, or White Strangers, and another body called Dubh-gâl, or Black Strangers, who succeeded in keeping a foothold in Leinster and a part of Ulster, and in making captives.

In the year 835, a large party of them entered the Loire in France, and fixed their head-quarters in the island of Hero, now called Noirmoutier, whence they made their incursions. The festival of All Saints had, long previous to this, probably upwards of two centuries, been in Rome observed on the first of November, as it still continues to be, by a regulation of Pope Boniface IV., who died in 615. From the Chronicle of Sigebert, we learn that the Emperor Louis, finding the bishops of France and of Germany anxious to have its observance on

the same day, regulated for that purpose with Pope Gregory IV., and being harassed by the incursions of the Scandinavian pirates and of the Saracens, in ordaining the office the following was directed to be sung in the hymn for matins:

Auferte gentem perfidam,
Credentium de finibus;
Ut unus omnes unicum
Ovile nos Postor regat.

"Take far away the wicked bands
Beyond the pale of Christian lands;
That Christ's one pastor thus may keep
In but one fold his ransomed sheep."

Hilberd, the Abbot of Noirmoutier, applied to Pepin, King of Aquitaine, for aid; but, as the island was considered indefensible against the pirates, it was decided to withdraw from it the relics of St. Filibert, its patron.

The French writers describe the Danes as now pouring in multitudes upon their northern coasts, to carry away captives into slavery and to load their vessels with booty. On the 12th of May, 841, they entered the Seine, whilst the sons of Louis were yet engaged in their unfortunate broils with each other, and Charles the Bald had become king. Ascending the river, they sacked Rouen, burning the monastery of St. Ouen, at that time outside the walls; leaving this place, they burned the monastery of Jumieges: that of Fontanelle was spared upon a ransom, and the monks of St. Denys paid them twenty-six pounds of silver for the ransom of sixty-six captives. On the last day of May they re-embarked, after having, within nineteen days, devasted an immense region along the banks of this river.

In 843, they ascended the Loire, in the month of June, and took the city of Nantes by escalade. It was at the time filled with the inhabitants of the neighbouring country, who had assembled to celebrate the festival of St. John the Baptist, June 24th. These retired to the cathedral, where the bishop and his clergy were, and shut the gates: those the Danes soon burst open, and committed dreadful carnage, carrying off immense booty and some captives, whom they sent to their ships, whither they were followed by some Christians, who brought money to ransom their friends.

In 844, they went farther south, up the Garonne, and pillaged Toulouse. Some, who made an inroad upon Gallicia, in Spain, were driven off by the Saracens. In 845, Raigner or Ragner Lodbrog, one of their vikings or sea-kings, entered the Seine with twenty-six vessels, landed at Rouen, in March, and spread terror and devastation on every side.

At Chavelanne, near St. Germain-en-Laye, they were informed that the monarch, Charles the Bald, was marching at the head of an army to attack them; they crossed the river to the side which was but feebly defended, continued their devastations, leaving in their rear several Christians hanging on trees, stakes, and even in the houses. They entered Paris on Easter Saturday, March 28th, and found the city and its environs nearly deserted. Charles, reluctantly, but with the advice of several of his lords, made a treaty with them, in which they swore by their gods and all that they held sacred, not to re-enter his kingdom, except upon his invitation, and he paid them seven thousand pounds of silver.

The pirates, however, after leaving the Seine, ravaged a portion of the sea-coast, and on their homeward voyage were wrecked on the Northumbrian coast, where the survivors, among whom was Ragner, began to plunder; but they were attacked by Ælla, who had usurped the throne of that kingdom. The pirate was taken and put to death. Ragner had ten sons, who vowed to revenge their father's death. At the head of a formidable fleet they approached the coast of East Angles, landed, and lived during winter on free quarters, and in the spring marked their advances to Northumbria, in lines of blood and ruin. Ælla fell into their hands, and suffered dreadful torture. Bernicia shared the fate of Deira, and during seven years Haldene was engaged in the work of devastation.

They did not lose sight of Ireland, and in 850 they compelled the monarch Melseachlin to make a treaty with them, by means of which they made several settlements.

In 845, they were defeated in their first enterprise upon Friesland, but, succeeding in two others, they gained a footing also here. An immense body of the Scandinavians sailed up the Elbe with six hundred vessels, large and small, under King Roric. St. Auscarius, Archbishop of Hamburg, at first thought to defend that city, but soon saw the folly of the attempt, and withdrew with what he could remove. The city was burned, but several captives were taken through the country. The forces of Roric were now poured upon Saxony; but they met a signal defeat, and their leader, learning the disasters of Ragner, sent messengers to Paderborn, where Louis, King of Germany, was then holding an assembly of his states, and was receiving to his alliance the people of Sclavonia and Bulgaria, who sent deputies to request that they might be also instructed in the Christian doctrine. The Scandinavians sued for peace, which they received upon the release of the persons whom they had taken to be their slaves, and the return of what booty they had.

The zeal of the holy Archbishop of Hamburg had previously prompted him to send missionaries into Scandinavia, to instruct those barbarians in the Christian religion, but Gausbert, whom he had consecrated bishop to carry the light of truth into Sweden, was with his companions driven thence by the people, after having been robbed of whatever goods they had.

The Normans, who succeeded in Friesland, proceeded by that side into France. Flanders fell under their assaults. Another division, in 848, sailing up the Garonne, laid siege to Bordeaux, which was betrayed into their hands by the Jews. After ravaging Aquitaine, they went to the district of Poictiers, or Poictou, whence they carried great booty. Roric, with his followers, after leaving the Elbe, went to the Rhine and the Scheldt, destroyed the monasteries as far as Ghent, and the Emperor Lothaire, being unable to subdue him, was content to receive him as his vassal, and gave him the large tract of territory which he had previously occupied. Godfrey, another of their chieftains, repulsed in an attack upon England, sailed up the Seine in 850; and after some achievements, obtained from Charles a territory round Beauvais in 850. Thus did the Northmen begin to make permanent settlements in the more southern regions of Europe, and an opportunity was thus given of bringing them to civilization and to Christianity. The history of this period, however, is a calamitous series of recitals of devastations committed by successive hordes of Northmen, and armies and squadrons of Saracens, upon those churches which had begun to be reduced to discipline, after the centuries of war and plunder by the Huns, the Goths, and the Vandals.

In 856 and 857, Paris and all the region between it and the British Channel were plundered with impunity, as also nearly all the region on the Atlantic coast of France as far in as Orleans; the churches, as usual, were either sacked or redeemed, and multitudes of captives carried away to slavery. This necessarily destroyed all notion of justice and all peace, and the capitularies of the monarchs, as well as the canons of the councils, exhibit the ruin of morality. We find, in 850, the greater number of the prelates and chief men of the vicinity of Flanders slain or in captivity. We find the pirates had circumnavigated Spain, entered the gulf of Lyons, committed depredations in Provence, and made incursions upon Italy; and in 861 the Seine was again infested, and Paris was terrified by seeing the Northmen at her gates, and two years afterwards the kingdom was scandalized by the apostacy of Pepin, the nephew of Charles and son of Pepin, King of Aquitaine, who had become a monk, and, when his father's realms were ravaged by this horde, publicly re-

nounced the Christian religion, embraced their idolatry, and joined their forces. He was subsequently taken by his uncle's troops, recanted his errors, did public penance, and returned to his monastery.

In 883, after the death of Louis, King of Germany, and the withdrawing of the troops who kept the Normans in check, they poured themselves on both sides of the Rhine, as high up as Coblentz; they overran Flanders, and made a stable of the fine chapel of Charlemagne, at Aix-la-Chapelle—a favourite usage of the French revolutionary soldiers, about forty or fifty years ago; I have seen some of the finest churches in France and Italy, which those desecrators of the holy name of liberty had thus profaned. The Emperor, Charles the Bald, returning from Italy, besieged a large body of them in a fortified camp near the Rhine. A treaty was made, and Godfrey with his band besought baptism, and received the duchy of Friesland. Sigefrey, the other chieftain, promised peace, upon receiving a large contribution.

Alfred, known, and deservedly so, as the Great, was the youngest of five sons of Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, and was born in 849. At the age of five years, his father declared him king of a portion of his dominions, and sent him to Rome, where he received the sacrament of confirmation and the regal unction from Pope Leo IV. Two years afterwards, Ethelwulf himself went to the Holy See, taking Alfred with him. In 872, Alfred became king of Wessex, upon the death of his brother Ethelred. This is not the place to dwell upon the history of his disasters or of his virtues. You are aware of his being obliged to conceal himself in the morasses of Somersetshire, and of the almost miraculous manner in which an opportunity was subsequently afforded him, of placing himself at the head of a body of his faithful followers, and how victory after victory enabled him to free his people from the Danish yoke. Gothrun, the Dane, submitted, and was received upon conditions, one of which was to embrace the Christian religion. He was instructed, and baptized by the name of Athelstan, Alfred himself being his sponsor; and, as Lingard remarks, "the followers of Guthrun gradually adopted the habits of civilized life; and, by acquiring an interest in the soil, contributed to protect it from the ravages of subsequent adventurers."

Alfred applied himself to revise the laws, to protect and to re-establish religion. He was a most pious and exemplary monarch. He created a navy, seeing that it must be the best natural bulwark of the island; he instituted the mode of trial by jury; he was also a patron of literature, which he sought to restore and to extend.

France was during this period so completely overrun by the pagans

in many places, that thousands of Christians, to escape death or bondage, publicly renounced their religion and embraced the pagan rites. We have, however, an interesting account of the resistance made by Paris, which then only occupied the island in the Seine, to the passage of their vessels. The emperor Charles the Fat, had confined it to Gozlin, its bishop; and he not only animated the people to its defence, but fought at their head, with his nephew Ebolus, an abbot, Odo, Eude, Count of Paris, and Robert his brother. The Normans continued the siege for many months, until the last day of January, 886, when they turned the siege into a blockade, which continued during a year. The Normans carried their vessels two miles over land beyond the city, and sailed up, ravaging the country. The emperor at last relieved the city by a dishonourable peace.

In 893, a fleet of three hundred and thirty sail assembled in the port of Boulogne, in France, under the command of Hastings, one of the most renowned of the sea-kings, for the purpose of conquering for him a kingdom in Britain. By force and stratagem they, during three years, contended against Alfred; and in place of being sustained against them by the Danes, to whom he gave a settlement in his dominions, he discovered that most of them took advantage of his position to return to the work of plunder. Alfred, by patience, by exertion, and by tactics, subdued them all, restored their prisoners, and obtained from Hastings a promise to leave the island for ever. Returning to France, this chief made incursions from the banks of the Seine, and before the close of the century, making a treaty with King Charles the Simple, he obtained the city of Chartres and the adjoining territory.

Having thus brought to your view the situation of England, of France, and of the Low-Countries under the Northmen, to the close of the ninth century, I return to Ireland.

In 853, a sea-king, who is indifferently styled Amlave, Auliffe, and Olave, accompanied by his two brothers, Sitric and Ivar, arrived in Ireland from Norway, with additional forces, and was acknowledged chieftain by all the Northmen in the island. Auliffe took possession of Dublin, which he enlarged. Ivar settled in Limerick, which he greatly improved, and Sitric began the building of Waterford. War raged between them and the Irish, and between parties of the Danes against each other; and intestine divisions existed also amongst the Irish, so that carnage and slavery for years devastated the island. The success was various. In 860, Melseachlin, the king, defeated Auliffe with great slaughter; and nine years subsequently this latter plundered Armagh, burned its sacred edifices, and took a large number of captives. In the

next year the two brothers, Auliffe and Ivar, made a descent upon Scotland, and burned Dunbarton. Auliffe died soon after his return in 871, and was succeeded by Ivar, who died in 873. In 884, they plundered Kildare, and carried away nearly 300 captives to their ships. In 895, Armagh was again devastated, and 710 captives carried away; soon after this the Danes were defeated and driven from Dublin by the men of Bregh, headed by Maol-Finia, the son of Flanagan, and by the Leinster forces, commanded by Carrol. In other parts of the island they also, at this period, suffered great defeats.

Not the least curious of the discoveries which are made from a perusal of the ancient documents which remain to us, is the wonderful disposition by which Divine Providence causes even the crimes of men to be made subservient to the ends of mercy. In examining the way in which the Irish who had been carried into slavery by the Northmen were distributed, I see that, although Iceland did not generally receive nor long retain the truths of the Gospel, yet they were published therein by some of the Irish captives that were carried thither by the Norwegians in this century. They who desire more information on the subject, can consult Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, volume iii., chapter 20, paragraph 4, and chapter xxii., paragraph 2.

I cannot, sir, better conclude this letter than by submitting to you the following remarks of the learned historian, Dr. Lingard, taken from chapter xxi. of his *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church.*

"The numerous massacres of the war had considerably thinned the population of the country; and, to supply the deficiency, Alfred had adopted an obvious but inadequate expedient, in the naturalization of several thousand Danes. In every county the strangers were intermixed with the natives. In East Anglia and Northumbria their numbers greatly exceeded the descendants of the ancient inhabitants. If the sacred rite of baptism had entitled the barbarians to the appellation and privileges of Christians, their manners and notions still reduced them to a level with their pagan brethren. The superstition of Scandinavia was in many places restored. The charms and incantations of magic amused the credulity of the people; the worship of Odin was publicly countenanced, or clandestinely preserved; and oaths and punishments were often employed in vain to extort from these nominal converts an external respect for the institutions of Christianity. The morals of many among the Anglo-Saxons were scarcely superior to those of the naturalized Danes. During the long and eventful contest, the administration of justice had been frequently suspended; habits of predatory warfare had introduced a spirit of insubordination; and impunity had

strengthened the impulse of the passions. To the slow and tranquil profits of industry, were preferred the violent but sudden acquisitions of rapine: the roads were infested with robbers, and the numbers and audacity of the banditti compelled the more peaceable inhabitants to associate for the protection of their lives, families, and property. The dictates of natural equity, the laws of the Gospel, and the regulations of ecclesiastical discipline were despised. The indissoluble knot of marriage was repeatedly dissevered at the slightest suggestion of passion or disgust; and in defiance of divine and human prohibitions, the nuptial union was frequently polluted and degraded by the unnatural crime of incest. To reform the degeneracy of his subjects, Alfred published a new code of laws, extracted from those of his predecessors and of the Jewish legislator; and the execution of forty-four judges in one year shows both the inflexible severity of the king, and the depravity of those whose duty it was to be the guardians of national morals. That his efforts were attended with partial success, is not improbable; but, from the complaints and improvements of later legislators, it is evident that it required a succession of several generations before the ancient spirit of licentiousness could be suppressed and extinguished."

This, sir, though written only for the state of England, is, by parity of circumstances, fairly aplicable to the greater portion of the Christian world at that period. Of that, however, more hereafter.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Respectfully, and so forth,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XVIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Apr. 23, 1840.

To the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, United States.

Sir:—In continuing to exhibit the outline of the ravages committed by the Northmen and the Saracens, my object is to show the grounds upon which I shall explain, why so many ages passed away subsequently to the promulgation of Christianity, before Christendom was delivered from the evils of predatory incursions, and the extensive prevalence of domestic slavery. In reviewing history, it is folly to substitute speculation for the recital of facts; and it is upon this ground that I prefer the tedious recital which I give, to getting through in a couple of dashing letters, which would give less information to the understanding, though they might be better calculated to glitter before the imagination.

We have seen that nearly all the northern coast of France was, if not in possession, yet at least in the power of the Danes or Northmen, at the close of the ninth century. Many of them, yielding to the zeal of some of the clergy, had embraced the Christian religion; and amongst those who were most devoted to their instruction was Hervey, Archbishop of Rheims, who consulted Pope John X. upon the subject. Charles the Simple, finding himself unable to repress their incursions, by the advice of his nobles, treated with them; Francon, Archbishop of Rouen, was the mediator. Charles gave in full fee to Rollo, the Danish chief, all that province thenceforth known as Normandy, and his daughter Gisle, as his spouse. Rollo promised to become a Christian, and to do homage as a vassal of the crown of France for the dukedom, of what was subsequently known as Britanny. In 912, having been instructed by Francon, Rollo was baptized by the name of Robert, and married Gisle, the daughter of Charles III., or the Simple. The greater number of his leading officers, following the example of their chief, were instructed, baptized, and made alliance with the Franks. Normandy and Britanny became thus in some measure settled, but it took many years to bring other parts of the country into a similar position. Even in Britanny, as late as 942, we find the civil war, conspiracy, and treason, fomented by Pagans, who sought to subdue those that professed Christianity. In 943, William Longsword, Duke of Normandy, was thus slain by Arnold, Count of Flanders. Hugh, Duke of France, was engaged in almost continual war with a large body of Pagans who occupied Evreux and the surrounding regions. Louis IV., or the Foreigner (D'outre mer), had severe contests with Tourmond, a Norman apostate, who sought to bring Richard, son of William Longsword and his Normans back to idolatry, and who for this purpose, had formed an alliance with one of the Northern chiefs, called Sethric, or Sithric, who probably was one of those in Ireland. The confusion and barbarity of the times was not a little aided by the scandals of some of the prelates, who had been either placed in their seats or protected upon them by the warriors of the day, who were often enemies of religion.

In England, after the death of Alfred, in 901, there continued peace for some time, but Ethelwold, the nephew of this monarch, having disputed the succession with Edward, the son of Alfred, and finding himself the weaker, had recourse to the Danes then settled in Northumbria, but they were defeated in their efforts to sustain him, and the unfortunate aspirant himself was slain. "After the death of Ethelwold," writes Lingard, "five years elapsed without any important act of hostility: in 910, Edward conducted his forces into Northumbria and

spent five weeks in ravaging the country, and collecting slaves and plunder. The next year, the Northmen returned the visit."

After many minor efforts, the great contest for the possession of England took place in 937, between Aulaff, the Dane, and Athelstan, the grandson of Alfred, and after terrible carnage, it was decided in favour of the latter at Brunanburgh, in Northumbria; by this result, Athelstan became in reality the first King of England. Louis IV. of France, was son of Charles the Simple, by his wife Edgiva, the sister of Athelstan: when Charles was cast into prison by the treachery of Herbert, Count of Vermandois, the Queen of France fled to her brother in England, who became the protector of her son Louis, during thirteen years, whence this latter received the surname of D'Outre mer.

"Athelstan died in 940, having done much to perfect the institutions which Alfred had re-established or founded and improved. He was succeeded by Edmund, with whom Auliffe or Aulaff, who had for some time been settled in Dublin, Ireland, contended, as he had done with his brother and predecessor Athelstan, for the dominion of England. The Dane was more successful against Edmund than he had been against Athelstan, but he died in 941, and Edward recovered the territory over which his father had held dominion. He was assassinated in 946. His widow, Edgiva, is said to have been a princess of exemplary virtue, whose solicitude for the relief of the indigent, and charity in purchasing the liberty of slaves, amongst other acts of piety, have been highly extolled by our ancient writers." [37]

We have seen that in Ireland, in 902, the Northmen who had possession of Dublin and other parts of Leinster, were defeated and expelled by the people of that province under the command of Carrol, and by the men of Bregh under Maol Finia, who subsequently became a monk in Holmpatrick, and died in the reputation of great sanctity, in 903. They however returned, about ten years later, and a party that landed at Waterford, in 914, were put to the sword. Another division, however, succeeded in plundering Cork, Lismore and Aghadoe: and about the year 916, they were again in possession of Dublin, and ravaged a large portion of Leinster, killing Angare Mac Olioll, king of that province. They were attacked near Dublin, in 919, by Niell Glunndubh, King of Ireland, but they made a desperate resistance under the command of their chiefs Ivar and Sitric: the Irish monarch was slain together with several of his choice nobles and the flower of his army. In the next year, Donogh who succeeded Niell, avenged the death of his

[37] Lingard's *History of England,* ch. iv.

father, but though the barbarians were signally defeated, yet we find them, in 921, march, under the command of their King Godfrey, from Dublin to Armagh and plunder the city; and here is also the first instance in which we perceive, in Ireland, the churches and the officiating clergy to have been spared; this leads to the supposition, that there must have been in that band several who had embraced the Christian religion either in France or in England, or perhaps in both countries.

In 925, Aulaff or Auliffe, a son of Sitric, king of Northumbria, flying before Athelstan, went to Ireland, where he found many of his friends; we find also another Auliffe there, who is called son of Godfred, though perhaps it may be the same, and that his father took the name of Godfred in place of Sitric. He with a number of others committed several depredations in nearly all parts of the island for more than twenty years. In 947 and 948, they suffered two severe defeats from Congall II., in the latter of which, their King Blacar and the most efficient of his army were slain. It is conjectured by the historians of the day, that those defeats caused a large body of them, for the first time in Ireland, to offer themselves as converts to Christianity. Be the cause what it may,—the fact is well established that in this year, large bodies of the Northmen in Ireland embraced the Christian religion, though many of them retained their predatory habits; as the subsequent history of the island proves.

But that which most forcibly strikes the observer is the fact that not only in Ireland, but in France, in England and Flanders, the new converts to the faith appear to have been but little changed as a body, so far as regarded their piratical habits. Occasionally, indeed, we find that their conduct to their captives was not so cruel, and sometimes they spared the edifices of religion and the clergy. Nor was it only in those regions which they invaded, that they assumed the Christian name. Zealous missionaries had been also labouring during the entire of the tenth century in their own northern cradle, and though encountering formidable difficulties yet were their efforts in the holy cause crowned with no inconsiderable success; and though fleets were fitted out, expeditions undertaken, and invasions made, still there was some little mitigation of the attendant evils. From 980 to the close of the century, their incursions and conflicts desolated England, especially under Sweyn and Olave, in 995; this latter had already embraced the doctrines of Christianity; when he and his associate had convened for sixteen thousand pounds to withdraw their troops; Olave accompanied two prelates to Andover, where he received the sacrament of confirmation from the Bishop of Winchester, and promised Ethelred, who then

was the English monarch, never again to draw his sword against his Christian brethren. He kept the pledge and returning to Norway, engaged in efforts to convert his subjects until he was slain by Sweyn. In 1001, a party of the Northmen from the opposite shores of France, committed great depredations on the southwestern parts of Ethelred's dominions. In the next year, by the intervention of Pope John XV., through his legate Leo, assistant Bishop of Treves, the first written treaty extant between an English king and a foreign prince, was made, to establish lasting peace between Ethelred and Richard, Duke or Marquis of Normandy; this was sealed by the marriage of Ethelred, then a widower, with Emma, daughter of Richard; but the neglect with which Ethelred treated his young queen, and an atrocious massacre which he planned and executed on the 13th of November of the same year, destroyed all prospect of harmony. On this day, by preconcert, the Saxons rose upon the Danes throughout the island and a general massacre took place, not only of pagans but of Christians; not only of those who had settled by force in the island, but of those who had been legally naturalized; amongst the victims was Gunhilda, the sister of Sweyn, who had embraced Christianity and married Palig, a naturalized Northman. Sweyn, during the next four years, ravaged the country in revenge, and did not cease until he got thirty-six thousand pounds of silver. He, keeping the letter of his treaty, violated its spirit, for though he remained at home, he secretly permitted Turchill to proceed with a fleet to renew the depredations. Canterbury amongst other places was taken, from which, after great massacre, eight hundred captives were reserved for bondage or ransom; the primate Elphege was kept during seveal weeks prisoner in expectation of a ransom of three thousand pounds, and as he refused to send to his clergy or to his friends for the money, he was put to death on Easter Saturday, whilst preaching to his captors.

The Northman then, for a sum of forty-eight thousand pounds, sold his services to the King of England, and many of his followers accepted settlements in the island, whilst the crews of forty-five ships swore allegiance to the English monarch. It is useless to exhibit the struggles subsequently between Ethlered and Sweyn, the contests between Edmund Ironsides and Canute the Dane. It will suffice to state, that in 1017 Canute became the monarch of England, confirming his possession of the throne by his nuptials with Emma, the widow of Ethelred. In the laws which this monarch published, is a severe ordinance against the custom of sending Christians to be sold into slavery in foreign countries, thereby exposing them to the danger of falling into paganism. Upon the death of Canute, Harold, one of his illegitimate sons, took possession

of the English throne. Alfred, a half-brother of Edmund Ironsides, came from Normandy in the hope of being able to compete with him, but was seized upon, on the night after he had landed, together with his followers,—some were liberated, some were condemned to slavery, and the others put to cruel deaths. Edward the Confessor succeeded, and thus was the Saxon line reinstated upon Harold's death. This pious monarch restored as far as he could, the dominion of law, mitigated the oppression of the slave and of the vassal, and strove to extend the influence of religion; he also did much to place the liberty of the subject upon a solid basis. Harold filled up the short interval which marks the period from the death of Edward to the battle of Hastings, in which William, Duke of Normandy, a descendant of Rollo, by a desperate effort won the throne of England, and Harold perished in the field, and thus a new order of government commences under the successful descendant of the Northmen.

I shall here copy from the Appendix I., of Dr. Lingard's *History of England*, his general description of slavery in England under the Anglo-Saxon dynasties.

"The several classes, whose manners have been hitherto described, constituted the Anglo-Saxon nation. They alone were possessed of liberty, or power, or property. They formed, however, but a small part of the population, of which, perhaps, not less than two-thirds existed in a state of slavery. That all the first adventurers were freemen, there can be little doubt; but in the course of their conquests, it is probable that they found, it is certain that they made a great number of slaves. The posterity of these men inherited the lot of their fathers; and their number was continually increased by the free-born Saxons, who had been reduced to the same condition by debt, or had been made captives in war, or had been deprived of liberty in punishment of their crimes, or had spontaneously surrendered it to escape the horrors of want. The degradation and enslavement of a freeman were performed before a competent number of witnesses. The unhappy man laid on the ground his sword and his lance, the symbols of the free, took up the bill and the goad, the implements of slavery, and falling on his knees, placed his head in token of submission under the hands of his master.

"All slaves were not, however, numbered in the same class. In the more ancient laws, we find the esne distinguished from the theow; and read of female slaves of the first, second, and the third rank. In later enactments we meet with bordars, cocksets, parddings, and other barbarous denominations, of which, were it easy, it would be useless to investigate the meaning. The most numerous class consisted of those, who

lived on the land of their lord, near to his mansion, called in Saxon, his tune, in Latin, his villa. From the latter word, they were by the Normans denominated villeins, while the collection of cottages in which they dwelt, acquired the name of village. Their respective services were originally allotted to them according to the pleasure of their proprietor. Some tilled his lands, others exercised for him the trades to which they had been educated. In return they received certain portions of land with other perquisites, for the support of themselves and their families. But all were alike deprived of the privileges of freemen. They were forbidden to carry arms. Their persons, families, and goods of every description, were the property of their lord. He could dispose of them as he pleased, either by gift or sale; he could annex them to the soil or remove them from it; he could transfer them with it to a new proprietor, or leave them by will to his heirs. Out of the hundreds of instances preserved by our ancient writers, one may be sufficient. In the charter by which Harold of Buckenhale gives his manor of Spalding to the Abbey of Croyland, he enumerates among its appendages, Colgrin, his bailiff; Harding, his smith, Lefstan, his carpenter; Elstan, his fisherman; Osmund, his miller, and nine others, who probably were husbandmen; and these with their wives and children, their goods and chattels, and the cottages in which they live, he transfers in perpetual possession to the abbey.

"It should, however, be observed, that the hardships of their condition were considerably mitigated by the influence of their religion. The bishop was appointed the protector of the slaves within his diocess; and his authority was employed in shielding them from oppression. Their lords were frequently admonished that slave and freemen were of equal value in the eye of the Almighty: that both had been redeemed at the same price; and that the master would be judged with the same rigour as he had exercised towards his dependants. In general, the services of the slave were fixed and certain: if he performed them faithfully, he was allowed to retain his savings, and many of those who cultivated portions of land, or had received permission to exercise their trades in the burghs, acquired a comparative degree of opulence, which enabled them to purchase their liberty from the kindness or avarice of their lords. Even the laws suppose some kind of property in the slave, since they allow him to commute the legal punishment of whipping for a fine of six shillings, and fix the relief of a villein on a farm at the price of his best beast.

"The prospect of obtaining their freedom was a powerful stimulus to industry and good behaviour. Besides those who were able to pur-

chase it themselves, many obtained it from the bounty of benefactors. Some were emancipated by the justice and gratitude of their masters; others owed their freedom to motives of religion. When the celebrated Wilfrid had received from Edelwalch, King of Sussex, the donation of the isle of Selsey, with two hundred and fifty male and female slaves, the bishop instructed them in the Christian faith, baptized them, and immediately made them free. Their manumission was an act of charity frequently inculcated by the preachers: and in most of the wills which are still extant, we meet with directions for granting liberty to a certain number of slaves. But the commiseration of the charitable was more excited by the condition of *wite theow* (those who had been reduced to slavery by a judicial sentence) than of such as had been born in that state, and had never tasted the blessings of liberty. By the bishops in the Council of Calcuith, it was agreed to free, at their decease, every slave of that description; and similar provisions are inserted in the wills of the lady Wynfleda, of Athelstan, son of King Ethelred, and of Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury. Their manumission, to be legal, was to be performed in public, in the market, in the court of the hundred, or in the church at the foot of the principal altar. The lord, taking the hand of the slave, offered it to the bailiff, sheriff, or clergyman, gave him a sword and a lance, and told him that the ways were open, and that he was at liberty to go wheresoever he pleased.

"Before I conclude this subject, it is proper to add that the sale and purchase of slaves publicly prevailed during the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period. These unhappy men were sold like cattle in the market; and there is reason to believe that a slave was usually estimated at four times the price of an ox. To the importation of foreign slaves no impediment had ever been opposed: the export of native slaves was forbidden under severe penalties. But habit and the pursuit of gain had taught the Northumbrians to bid defiance to all the efforts of the legislature. Like the savages of Africa, they are said to have carried off, not only their own countrymen, but even their friends and relatives; and to have sold them as slaves in the ports of the continent. The men of Bristol were the last to abandon this nefarious traffic. Their agents travelled into every part of the country; they were instructed to give the highest price for females in the state of pregnancy; and the slave ships regularly sailed from that port to Ireland, where they were secure of a ready and profitable market. Their obstinacy yielded, however, not to the severity of the magistrates, but to the zeal of Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester. That prelate visited Bristol several years successively, resided for months together in the neighbourhood, and preached on every

Sunday against the barbarity and irreligion of the dealers in slaves. At last the merchants were convinced by his reasons, and in that gild solemnly bound themselves to renounce the trade. One of the members was soon after tempted to violate his engagement. His perfidy was punished with the loss of his eyes.

"We have still to consider a class of men, partly free, and partly slaves, the inhabitants of the cities, burghs and ports, which were the property sometimes of one, sometimes of several opulent individuals. The burghers were in general tradesmen and mechanics, divided into two classes: the one of men who held their houses by a fixed rent, and were at liberty to quit them when they pleased; the other of villeins, or the descendants of villeins, who had been permitted to migrate from the country for the benefit of trade, and lived in houses which were considered as portions of the manors to which the original settlers had belonged.—The burghers were still annexed to the soil, and transferable with it; and were still compelled to do service in like manner with their brethren in the country. But all possessed superior advantages. They were better protected from the attack of an enemy; they enjoyed the benefit of a market for the sale of their wares.—They formed gilds or corporations, which guaranteed the good conduct of their members, and were under the government of the reeve or chief lord. But the privileges and burdens, the customs and services of the inhabitants of different burghs, and frequently of those in the same burgh, were so various, complex, and contradictory, that it is impossible to arrange them under distinct heads, or to describe them with accuracy.—They originated in the wants, the caprice, the favour of the several proprietors; and those who desire a more ample gratification of their curiosity on this subject must have recourse to the authentic pages of Domesday."

In Ireland, after the conversion of the Northmen had commenced, as we have previously seen, in the year 948, we have nearly a repetition of the former scenes of turmoil, until the power and spirit of this formidable and restless race were broken at Clontarf, near Dublin, on the 23d of April, (Good Friday) in the year 1014, when they suffered an irrecoverable defeat from the Irish forces under the command of the celebrated monarch, Brian Boromme, who at the age of 88 years drew up his troops in good order and led them to victory. Though in its results Ireland had to rejoice in the perfect overthrow of those ruthless invaders, yet had she to weep over the bodies of Brian, of his son Morogh, who fell in the 63d year of his age, and of his grandson Turlogh, together with those of a host of the nobility and most valiant warriors who fell for the liberation of their country.

Here, sir, I shall close what I had to remark of the impediments created in England and in Ireland to the progress of religion and the mitigation of slavery by the piratical Northmen. I shall have still to unfold more of the difficulties upon the continents of Europe and of Asia.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Respectfully, and so forth,
JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 25, 1841.

To the Editors of the United States Catholic Miscellany.

Gentlemen:—My more pressing duties will not permit me for some weeks to continue the letters on the compatibility of domestic slavery with practical religion. I have been asked by many, a question which I may as well answer at once, viz.: Whether I am friendly to the existence or continuation of slavery? I am not—but I also see the impossibility of now abolishing it here. When it can and ought to be abolished, is a question for the legislature and not for me.[38]

Yours, with esteem,
JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

[38] Note sent by Bishop England to the Editor of the *Miscellany*, after suspending the publication of his letters.

CEREMONIES OF THE MASS

[An explanation of the Mass, somewhat differing in a portion of its contents from this, was fixed by Bishop England to his *English Missal*; but the similarity of the two Essays is so great, that it has not been thought necessary to publish both.]

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

IRISH COLLEGE, ROME, Mar. 5, 1833.

To his Eminence Cardinal Weld, and so forth.

My Lord Cardinal:—Had I written a book worth dedicating to your Eminence, I should be gratified by your permission to inscribe it to you. These few sheets are yours by a better title; and when I offer them, I can only express my regret at their unavoidable imperfection.

Your Eminence felt very properly the great inconvenience to individuals, and the serious injury to our holy religion, that continually arose from the want of any sufficient mode by which those numerous and respectable strangers, whose most familiar language was English, could be made acquainted with the nature and object of that ceremonial which they had perpetually before them in this city.

The weighty, numerous, and important avocations that engrossed your attention, prevented your Eminence from executing a task that you were desirous of performing; the other clergymen who were qualified for such an undertaking, were too much occupied by their ordinary duties; and the business which I had at the Holy See not appearing then to be in so forward a state as to require my immediate and continued attention, you suggested to me the utility of preparing such an explanation as would be of service for the Holy Week that was approaching, and might form the basis for a more perfect work.

Entering fully into the views of your Eminence, I undertook the task; and during the last three or four weeks, have at such intervals as I could devote to it, compiled this explanation of the Mass.

From the manner in which it has been composed, and drawn, as it were, from my pen to the press, with scarcely a moment for reading what had been written, it must necessarily have great imperfection of style: but I feel confident that it is accurate in its statement of facts, and reference to authorities, as I was most scrupulous in having the

very passage of every author to whom I refer, before me whilst I wrote.

As probably the greater number of those for whose use it is designated, are unfortunately separated from our communion, and as I have generally found on both sides of the Atlantic, that however well educated and extensively informed such persons might be upon other subjects, they had the most incorrect notions of our doctrine, very little knowledge of its distinct separation from our discipline, and scarcely any idea of the history of the latter, it became necessary for me to enter into exposition somewhat more in detail than I otherwise should have done: for it would be folly to expect that the ceremonial could be intelligible to persons who had not some information upon those points. I was the more encouraged to this, from the spirit of candour and desire for information that I have, in most instances, found amongst the better educated and more polished classes of our separated brethren. Hence explanations will be found upon several of our controverted tenets; but neither the nature of the compilation, nor the circumstances under which I was placed, gave any opportunity for exhibiting the proofs by which our doctrine is sustained. These elucidations, therefore, are divested of any semblance of polemical discussion. I trust they will be read in a spirit corresponding to that in which they were written; that of respect for the feelings and understandings of those from whom we differ, but with an unshaken conviction on our part, that we hold to the original doctrine and divine institutions, from which so lamentable a departure has been made.

Having prepared, in the first instance, the explanation of the Mass, because in nearly all the other ceremonials continual reference must be made either to some of its parts, or to some of the doctrines whose exposition it has drawn forth, I am now about to commence upon the peculiar observances of the Holy Week, though much more closely pressed by my other business than I had expected. However, I trust I shall experience from the very eminent venerable, and amiable Cardinal Pedicini, prefect of the Congregation of the Propaganda, a continuation of that indulgence I have already met with at his hands, so as to be permitted to finish this little work. And as your Eminence is so useful a member of that congregation, I must also take this opportunity of testifying, that not only in regard to the business of ordinary duty that brought me in connexion with them, but likewise with respect to whatever might benefit me, and especially the help necessary for what I have thus undertaken, I have received the kindest attentions from every officer of that valuable establishment; and in a way which I can never repay, and cannot revert to, but with most grateful recollection, the marked

friendship of its zealous, laborious, useful, and enlightened secretary, Monsignor Castracane.

Permit me, my Lord Cardinal, to add, that few circumstances in life have afforded me so much satisfaction as those which placed me in the hands of your Eminence, as the instrument for at least commencing a little work, which some one with more leisure and better abilities, would perhaps, at a future day, bring to a more valuable and useful form. Though many years have elapsed since I first heard from one of the brightest ornaments of the English missions, the learned Bishop Milner, and one of the most illustrious members of the Irish Hierarchy, the venerable Bishop Moylan, the eulogium which you then deserved, it is only a short time since I have enjoyed the opportunity of being, by observation, convinced that neither they nor the late venerable Pontiff, who placed you in the station your Eminence now fills with so much credit to yourself and benefit to the church, over-estimated your merit. One other circumstance adds much to the gratification which I have thus experienced; that in the Cardinal who to-day labours for the progress of religion in the United States, I recognise the Acolyth, who nearly forty-three years ago, in the chapel of his family castle, bore the censer at the consecration of the first prelate of the American Hierarchy. Yes, my Lord Cardinal, it is to me a great consolation, as an American bishop, to have been thus employed by a member of the august senate of our church, who, emulating even as a youth the fidelity of ancestors, that through a desolating persecution of centuries had preserved their faith uncontaminated, himself officiated at the consecration of John Carroll, the patriot, the missionary, the prelate, the metropolitan, the sage, and I trust the saint. Precious, indeed, to an American Catholic is every circumstance connected with the memory of that great and holy man, who, in the almost boundless land of his nativity, first cultivated with success, under the auspices of Pius VI. that grain of mustard seed, which rapidly growing to a mighty tree, and, protected by Gregory XVI., is new extending its branches not only above an enlightened community reposing in peace under its shadow, but even to those unhappy children of the desert, who have long been exposed to the scorchings of infidelity and suffered from parching thirst after the living stream of the Gospel.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord Cardinal,

Your Eminence's most devoted,

Respectful, and obedient servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

EXPLANATION OF THE MASS

The Mass is believed by Catholics to be an unbloody sacrifice in which by the power of God, the institution of Christ, and the ministry of the priest, the body and blood of our blessed Saviour are produced upon the altar, under the appearances of bread and wine; and are there offered to the Almighty, not only as a propitiation for the sins of mankind, but also in testimony of the adoration or homage which is his due; in thanksgiving for benefits received, in which view it is eucharistic; and to beseech future favours, whereby it is impetratory.

It is not therefore a mere prayer in which a public minister leads a congregation; but it is the performance of a solemn act of religion, the nature of which is fully understood and appreciated by those who assist, even though they should not hear a word that is spoken, or if hearing, should not understand the exact meaning of the language that is used. By the divine institution of old, it was in some instances regulated, that the priest who ministered on behalf of the people, was not only not heard by them, when he prayed, but not seen by them when he offered incense. Yet though several, who for want of opportunity, are not aware of the grounds for using, generally, the Latin language on this solemn liturgical occasion, are apt hastily to condemn the practice; it is believed that if they knew these reasons they would deem them sufficient: a few of the principal shall therefore be briefly mentioned.

First. The Catholic Church had its origin at a period when this language was generally used through the civilized world: the great doctrines of our holy religion were therefore not only conveyed to several nations in this tongue, but in this they were at an early period recorded: and those records, whether they be inspired writings or others which though not so precious yet are highly valuable, will be rendered most useful by having the liturgy in the same language.

Next. Some of the most ancient liturgies were compiled in Latin. And as it is now a dead and an unchanging tongue, not only shall we have the most perfect evidence of the authenticity of these compilations, but also the certainty of our belief corresponding with that of their compilers, by preserving their ideas through the use of their own language.

Again. Though scattered through so many various nations, from the rising to the setting of the sun, and from one pole to the other, Catholics not only have the same faith, the same ecclesiastical government, and the same sacraments, but also the same sacrifice: it is, therefore, exceedingly convenient that they should, in regard to these great and important subjects, as far as may be, have only one language: so

that however separated, by rivers, by mountains, by seas, by climate, by customs, by modes of government, and all the other circumstances which create so much diversity upon the face of the earth, they might find themselves united by this great bond of communion at the holy altar, in the house of their common Father, before the throne of their one God, in hopes of mercy through their only Redeemer. Thus, be their vernacular tongue what it may be, their colour dark or fair; whether they first breathed upon the banks of the Ganges or the Tiber, or the Mississippi or the Danube, whether migrating from Siberia or Peru; the common language of their common faith, is that of the ministers of the church which offering this clean and holy oblation from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, collects her children from all tribes and tongues and nations, into one fold under one Shepherd. The priest by this regulation can officiate at every altar, the faithful find themselves everywhere at home: notwithstanding all other varieties, the sameness of the language and the sameness of the ceremonial prevent their being strangers in religion.

The language of Peter, of Mark, of Cyprian, of Augustin, of Ambrose, of Jerome, of Gregory, and of so many others, who in the early days of the church, extended her faith and exhibited her perfection, is that which is preserved by her to-day: by it each prelate is the judge and the witness of the unchanged doctrine of his fellow-labourers; by it the head communicates with the members; and from its preservation many other benefits not here adverted to arise. One inconvenience only, that of its supposed unintelligibility, can for a moment be urged; but when weighed against so many advantages, this is exceedingly light: besides, it is generally removed by the fact that translations of the liturgy may be had in almost every living language, and the consideration, that as the Mass is not a common prayer, there is no need of knowing the precise meaning of the words, when the nature of the action itself is fully understood. Neither is the Latin so unintelligible to Catholics, as their separated brethren imagine. A liturgy in a vernacular tongue is indeed intelligible to that nation, in which that tongue is used, but its benefit is confined within the limits which circumscribe that people. It might suit a national establishment, but is not adapted to the service of that church which is Catholic, that is universal; a church which has existed in every age and which is found in every nation.

Ceremony is of two kinds: that which is of divine institution, and that which is of ecclesiastical origin. Of the first some is so essential that it cannot be either omitted or seriously changed without altogether defeating the great object of the institution itself. Other ceremonies

though highly venerable because of their origin, and their object, yet can by no means be placed on a level with the former. The remarks that follow are to be considered as restricted to the latter.

The objects of ceremony are public decency, distinction of officers, instruction and edification. The power of modifying it according to time, place, and other circumstances, exists of course in the proper legislative tribunal of the church, and it would be well to observe that the exercise of this authority is perfectly compatible with the unchangeable nature of doctrine, as also that its existence in the proper tribunal does not warrant its assumption by subordinate bodies, much less by unauthorized individuals.

Amongst ceremonial regulations one of the first regards the official dress. This is not peculiar to ecclesiastics; similar regulations exist in halls of justice, in the army, in the navy, in a variety of other institutions. Though during the first ages, in many instances, the policy of the church, because of the danger of persecution, was rather the concealment than the exhibition of her officers, yet under those circumstances which afforded the opportunity, we find that her prelates and her priests were distinguished, as were also her minor clergy, from the great body of the faithful, even by their vesture. The principle had not only been approved but introduced, and established by the Lord God himself, when he regulated the splendid ceremonial of the Judaic rite. Nor are we to infer from the rejection of its transient and figurative special observances at a period when their object had been fully attained, that this principle was condemned. Yet is the peculiar costume of the clergy far from being one of the essentials of religion; though thereby beauty is given to the house of the Lord, the several orders and their attendants are easily and properly distinguished, and to the instructed observer, deep lessons of pure religion and practical piety, are easily, rapidly and impressively communicated.

In the sacred vesture, the antiquarian will discover the greater portion to consist of the ancient Roman robes of state, somewhat changed in form, and with some few additions either for convenience or ornament. This ancient costume consisted principally of the toga and trabea. These observations are confined to the vesture used at the celebration of Mass: the garments worn on ordinary occasions are to be considered rather matter of private or social regulation: they differ not only in different countries, but according as the clergy belong to different religious associations: even in the same city they vary exceedingly; some priests, for instance, follow a rule of life written by St. Augustin, others a rule compiled by St. Benedict, some a rule formed by St. Francis,

others the rule of St. Dominic, others that of St. Ignatius; some devote themselves to labour for the redemption of Christian captives, others to foreign missions, some to the education of youth, others to the service of parishes, and some to the care and ceremonial of churches: more than one hundred societies seek as many modes to sustain religion. This great variety of priests of the same faith, and the same order, striving however to promote a common object, the service of God and the salvation of souls, in so many different ways, all under the sanction of their common mother, the Catholic Church, and with the approbation of their common father, the Pope, presents to the stranger an inexplicable diversity: but to him who understands their institute, their various costumes exhibit not only their respective occupations, but also frequently furnish very curious information respecting the customs and habits of the ages and nations in which the several orders had their origin.

Before we proceed to examine the dress, let us become acquainted with the edifice. We shall now consider a Catholic church as a Christian temple, erected for the purpose of having the holy sacrifice of the Mass offered therein. This sacrifice is made upon an altar, which is a table sufficiently large to sustain the offerings, the book and other necessaries. Though there may be several altars in the church, we shall confine ourselves to one: this is generally more conspicious than the others, and is called the principal or high altar. Formerly the holy sacrifice was offered in the catacombs, upon the tombs of the martyrs. And frequently since that period, when splendid temples were erected, their bodies or remains have been removed from those obscure resting-places, and enshrined in rich sarcophagi, over which the table of the altar was placed. The relics of other saints have been also, in several instances, thus entombed. The altar indeed is erected only to the adoration of God, but it is also under the invocation of the saint; and though that happy being, formerly our fellow-mortal on earth, but now through the merits of the Redeemer, glorified in heaven, is invoked to unite his suffrages with those of his fellow-servants in this vale of tears, whilst they surround this table, yet it is to God alone this sacrifice is offered, to him only adoration is paid. Some of the best and most ancient interpreters of the sacred volume inform us that the splendid description of the Apocalyptic visions given by St. John in the fourth and following chapters of the book of Revelations, corresponds so exactly to the mode in which the holy sacrifice was offered solemnly in the Eastern church about the period when the Evangelist was confined in the island of Patmos, that it is very probable, the vision was nearly its exact counterpart, and that what the opened heavens exhibited in

superior splendour, only more gloriously showed forth what the fervent Christians practised here below. Like Him who was seated upon the throne in the midst of the four-and-twenty elders, and the four living things, the bishop presided in the midst of his clergy with burning lights before his seat, whilst from the evangelical narratives, unceasing praises were given to the Holy One of heaven, eternal, and supreme. In the midst of this chaunting assembly was the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world; He was exhibited as if slain yet living: before this Redeemer who saved the nations by His blood, those whom He made priests poured forth from their golden phials, in aromatic odours, the fragrant prayers of the saints, whilst their melodious voices and sweet instruments, in rich harmony, rendered to the coequal Victim the same homage that was given to Him that was pre-eminent above all.

The rapt Evangelist beheld under the heavenly altar, where stood the immolated lamb, the souls of those slain for the word of God. Glorious in their blood, they reposed in celestial bliss until their expected companions should arrive; whilst under the altars upon the earth, their bodies rested honourably enshrined in those places where the lamb was produced as slain, and offered in the midst of the holy choirs below. But they were to remain awhile separated from their souls, and their vindications, as it were, delayed until the number of their brethren should be filled up: then would those bodies that had been sanctified by the waters of baptism, enriched with the christmatic unction, fed with the body of the Lord, bodies which had been the very tabernacles of the Holy Ghost, and the instruments of so many works of virtue and of power, spring at the Archangel's summons from their lowly beds, gloriously ascend to their expecting souls, and in their restored flesh see God their Saviour. Until that awful but glorious day, it is a pious custom to preserve in veneration here below, those relics, which for eternity shall be placed by the Almighty in the splendid mansions of his heavenly court. Thus they are not only kept within the altar, but also in other parts of the church.

Frequently, too, the edifice is decorated with paintings and statuary; the subjects are naturally connected with religion, representing persons or actions described in the sacred volume, or those of a period more recent than that at which its narrative closes. It is asserted that miracles have been wrought by the Almighty through the instrumentality of some few of those. That it was in his power to perform the miracles, and that he might have used these as instruments upon the occasion, are truths so plain as to be obviously unquestionable; but it would be equally a departure from the common principles of prudence

to admit, or to reject every such statement without any examination of the grounds upon which it rested. The principle of true religion is indeed the principle of common sense, and by this we are informed that our faith does not demand our belief in the truth of any particular miracle not recorded in the Holy Scriptures, though undoubtedly several others have been wrought. Without, however, casting unbecoming reflections upon statements, of whose truth we are not fully satisfied, we may indulge our piety where our understandings are convinced, and also pay to the intellect and disposition of those who believe more than we do, and who act accordingly, that homage which we expect for ourselves; full liberty of thought and action, where they have not been restrained by the divine law, together with the courtesy due from one rational and religious being to his fellow.

The crucifix or image of the Saviour in his state of bloody immolation, is very appropriately placed upon the centre of the altar where that commemorative immolation is to made. On each side candles are lighted, not only as a token of joy, but also as by their blaze they mystically exhibit the descent of the Holy Ghost in the form of tongues of fire for the purpose of endowing the Apostles, the first ministers of the Catholic Church, with power from on high, to perform the stupendous works for which they were commissioned by an incarnate God. For it is not by human power, but by the operating influence of that sacred Spirit that the mighty change is to be effected upon that holy table. St. Jerome informs us that more than fourteen centuries ago, they were accustomed as an ancient usage in the East, to have burning torches even under a blazing sun, when the Gospel was proclaimed; thus exhibiting not merely their gladness at hearing the enlightening truths, but by the very glare showing how this emanation from the orient on high shed its cheering and invigorating influence upon those who sat in darkness, and in the shadow of death.

How often has the well-informed Catholic, whilst his soul was absorbed in these instructive recollections, been drawn aside from his devotional feelings and induced to pity some self-sufficient stranger, who, without a single idea of the nature of the objects by which he was surrounded, passed his irreverent and indiscriminate censure upon all that was venerable for its antiquity, useful for its instruction, and calculated to cherish piety, by arresting attention and fixing it upon the most important truths of redemption? How often, too, alas! has the careless Catholic been himself unmoved and an indifferent spectator of a scene, with which he has perhaps, been too familiar, and which by reason of his negligence, has ceased to produce upon him those effects

for which it was originally intended, and to produce which it is so admirably calculated!

The altar is a consecrated stone. This has been the case during upwards of fifteen hundred years, previously to which period, no law prescribed any particular material. The table upon which the Holy Eucharist was first consecrated by the Saviour of the world, and of course upon which the divine oblation was first made, was of wood. And there is every reason to believe, that it is the same which is still preserved and shown at the church of St. John of Lateran. Those which were used by the Apostles were probably also of wood. Two of those used by St. Peter are shown in Rome, one of which is preserved in the high altar of the same church of St. John, upon which only the Pope celebrates: the other, that is in the church of St. Pudentiana, is believed to be that upon which this apostle offered the holy sacrifice in the house of the senator Pudens. But the mystic reason for the law which requires at present a different material is, that the altar itself should represent Christ, who is the rock of salvation, upon which are raised the members of that spiritual edifice which constitutes this church, It is covered with linen cloths to denote the purity, as various additional ornaments exhibit the richness of the other virtues expected in all who approach to so holy a place. The church also, by the very colour of the front of the altar, and of the vestments, teaches her children the nature of the solemnity which she celebrates. Thus for instance, white is used upon the great festivals of the Trinity, of the Saviour, of his blessed mother, of angels, of saints, who without shedding their blood gave their testimony by the practice of exalted virtues, and on some other occasions. Red is used on the feast of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost descended in the form of tongues of fire; on the festivals of martyrs, and the like. In times of penance, violet is used, green on days when there is no special solemnity; and black on Good Friday, and on occasion of offices for the deceased.

The bishop or priest who is to celebrate Mass must be fasting from the previous midnight: for one of the most ancient laws of discipline, testified as existing in every age, and believed to have been first introduced by St. Paul at Corinth, requires that not the smallest particle of food, solid or liquid, shall have been swallowed before the Holy Eucharist. The object of this discipline was, in the first place, to remove altogether the great scandals of which the apostle complains; and secondly, to excite the highest veneration for the sacrament, and to cause the most perfect preparation to be made for receiving, which of course must necessarily be done by the celebrant. Frequently when a bishop cele-

brates solemnly, he reads several psalms selected for that purpose, together with certain prayers, near the altar, before his attendants bring him the vestments; on other occasions he reads them privately as the priests do, before coming to the sacred robes.

Whatever may have been the original use of the several vestments, the church has attached to each of them mystical or figurative significations; to some of which allusion is made by the celebrant, in a prayer which he recites when he clothes himself therewith. It has been previously remarked that they consist of the toga and trabea, with some few additions. The first vestment is one of those additions now generally called an amict: this is a large piece of linen, not unlike an open kerchief or shawl. It is first placed on the head, next on the shoulders, and then brought round the throat: and for the more convenient fastening of it, ribands or strings are attached to the upper corners, by means of which, after having been adjusted, it is kept in its place.

The general remarks explanatory of this portion of the vesture will equally apply to all others. We are led to seek for the period of its introduction, for its natural utility or convenience, for the mystical or instructive meaning as referring to the Saviour, and for the same as regards the person who is clothed therewith.

Previously to the introduction of neck-cloths by the Croats, after the ninth or tenth century, the throat was quite uncovered, nor was there any usual head dress, save hoods, or helmets; hence, in the earlier ages, the head and neck of the clergyman, without some precaution, would have been exposed to the cold and damp air of the churches, at hours when its effects were exceedingly dangerous, especially to those who, after loud reading or chaunting, were obliged to remain under its influence. To guard against this inconvenience, therefore, a large linen cloth was thrown over the head, and hung down upon the shoulders; but when the wearer was about to officiate at the altar, he respectfully uncovered his head, and enveloped his throat. It was introduced for this purpose at a very early period, and indeed a similar custom seems to have existed in some places, even before Christianity. Without, however, entering into a disquisition respecting the precise date of its adoption, it is sufficient to remark that we find the amict used in the very early ages of the church, and are not able to point out the places or time when it was first made an ecclesiastical vesture. By many it is said, and with great probability, to correspond to the ephod of Judea.

As the suffering of the Redeemer became the great subject of the Christian's meditation, the church availed herself of every object presented to the observation of her children, especially in the temples, to

assist their recollection. She therefore gave to everything used in the sacred edifice a mysterious signification. She told the observers that when they beheld the clergyman, with the amict on his head, it should be to them the occasion of recollecting how, for the salvation of the human race, He who for us became the outcast of his nation, was blindfolded, and buffeted, and covered with spittle; hense they should learn of Him to be meek and humble of heart. To the clergyman himself, in giving this clothing on the day of ordination, she communicated also the admonition, in the words of the bishop, that the amict should remind him of the prudence and caution to be observed in his speech by abstaining from idle conversation, and reserving his voice for chaunting the praises, or proclaiming the glories of his God. The prayer used by the clergyman while clothing himself therewith, reminds him of the necessity of heavenly protection against the enemies of his soul, for he beseeches the Lord to guard him against the assaults of the devil, by the helmet of salvation. Some clergymen still wear the amict on the head during the first part of the Mass.

The alb and cincture, though now separate, were united in the ancient toga. The alb, as its name denotes, is a white garment, and is put on after the amict; it was the state dress of the gentry and of several public officers of Rome. On the occasion of festivals, the toga was white: when the wearer was unoccupied, it flowed loosely about his person: when he was engaged in business, he was *accinctus*, that is, his toga was girt up, and fastened about him. The alb was so generally used, that we have scarcely an instance of its omission in any of our descriptions of a Christian ceremonial. In subsequent times, indeed, the surplice and rochet, which are smaller white dresses, came into use for the clergy who were not attending in the performance of any of the more solemn functions; but the alb and cincture were always retained by those who were occupied in the principal duties. The beholders saw in the alb, the Saviour clothed in the white garb, and sent back by Herod to Pilate, despised as a fool; and hence they learned not to be ashamed at sometimes finding that the worldly wise, misled by their own self-sufficiency, derided and mocked the sacred institutions of the Saviour, or the solemn observances of the church. The same vesture admonished its wearer of the purity of mind and body, which should in the sight of heaven decorate him who, professing to put off the old man with his works of darkness, appeared as a son of light in the splendour of his raiment, near that Lamb upon which he undertook to attend. The cincture reminded the faithful of the cord which bound their victim, when He was dragged by a tumultous rabble from tribunal to tribunal; whilst

he who girt himself therewith for the duties of the ministry, prayed upon the principle and in the spirit of the Saviour's own monition, that he might obtain grace to restrain his unruly desires, and be thus enabled to afford the brightness of holy example.

The priest is also commissioned to aid in announcing the Gospel; he is a herald of heavenly tidings; he is an instructor of the people; to preach is a part of his office. Formerly the public orator wore a long roll or piece of folded linen thrown over his shoulders, and depending on either side in front of his person, thus having somewhat the appearance of the border of a Persian stole. It was generally used for the purposes to which public speakers now apply handkerchiefs; hence it was by some called *Sudarium*, or towel; by other writers it was called the *orarium*, for which various explanations may be found; but latterly it is known as the stole. In process of time it became decorated: the principal of its ornaments was the cross, which generally, in one way or other, became the discriminating token of the several pieces of ecclesiastical furniture. The priest retained the stole as emblematic and instructive, though upwards of twelve centuries have elapsed since its primitive use was discontinued. He now crosses it on his breast when he is about to celebrate Mass, and binds it in its place with the cincture.

The faithful are told that it should remind them of the manner in which the Saviour was bound to the cross when he was slain for our offences; and as it forms a sort of yoke laid on the shoulders, the wearer, as well in the admonition which he received, when first vested therewith at his ordination, as in the prayer which he recites when he is about to put it on, is referred to that of the blessed Jesus, who can so enable him to bear the burden of his duties, as to find them a light labour of love, and so to persevere, under the yoke of the divine law, as to find it sweet here and conducive to happiness hereafter.

When the destination of the stole was changed, the maniple supplied its place. This was a handkerchief, thrown over the left arm, and deriving its name from the Latin word *manus*, a hand, either because it was carried on the hand, or, as some will have it, because it was a handful. Others say it was so called by change from *mappula*, a handkerchief: it soon became ornamented, and is now retained only for a similar purpose as the stole. It reminds the congregation of the cord by which the Lamb of God was bound to the pillar, when he was scourged for our sins: as it is a sort of oppressive weight upon the arm, it teaches the wearer that if he performs with fidelity his portion of the irksome labour in the Christian field, he will be brought with gladness to the

recompense. The prayer is to obtain from heaven the grace necessary for this purpose.

The ancient trabea was a robe of state, generally of embroidered silk, or other fine and rich texture. It was very ample; in the midst of it was an aperture for the head; when put on, it rested on the shoulders of the wearer, and, except when gathered into folds in any part, hung down on every side, flowing even to the ground. Being gathered occasionally at either side, to give liberty for using the hands, when the plaits were drawn up to the shoulders, and fastened on them by loops or cords, this vesture had to the front and back the appearance of deep and rich festoons, whilst at the sides it was open. Such was the origin of the ordinary chasuble, or priest's vestment for the celebration of Mass, and for some other very solemn occasions. In going to the altar his attendant raised it; but gradually the custom was introduced of making incisions at the sides, until several centuries since it assumed its present appearance of festoons depending from the front and back, the sides remaining perfectly open. The decoration is not in every country the same; in some churches there is a representation on the front, by two strips of lace, of a pillar representing the church, which is the pillar and foundation of truth, upon which the clergyman rests for support: and on the back is the cross, to show how the Saviour bore that bed of sorrows to Calvary, when he went to the sacrifice. In other churches the cross is not only on the back, but also on the front; whilst in some churches it is only on the front, and in other churches on neither part. The origin of this decoration is generally supposed to be the *latus clavus* of the Roman senators, which was a wide purple stripe on the front and back of this vestment; and the representation of its edges being retained, even after the distinction of colour ceased, it would thus exhibit the appearance of columns on the front and the back. In several places the Christian clergy added to these, on either or both sides, those transverse pieces, or that embroidery which changed the columns into crosses. This vestment represents the seamless garment of Christ, for which the soldiers cast lots, and it is emblematic of the charity which should not only prevent schisms, but even unkindly feelings in the ministry. Others will have it for the body of the faithful, the emblem of the purple garment flung upon the shoulders of Jesus after his scourging, and when he was exhibited in the mockery of regal dignity; whilst its decorations imply in him who bears it the exhibition of the virtues with which he should be surrounded.

The deacon is the first minister attending upon the priest who celebrates this holy office. His vesture consists of the amiet, alb, cinc-

ture, maniple, stole, and dalmatic; but his stole, as a token of the inferiority of his order, is not placed on both shoulders. As one who may be commissioned to preach, he is entitled to use this ornament, especially on those ocasions when he is to announce the Gospel; but its being only on his left shoulder, and gathered so as to meet under his right arm, to prevent its flowing in a loose or uncomely manner, exhibits his ministerial subordination. At the sacred table he is also but an attendant, not a principal. His first predecessors, amongst other objects were ordained to serve not only at the table of the Eucharistic banquet, but also to superintend the tables, at which the first Christians gave their refection to those members whose wants require a share of the daily alms. From the earliest period such attendants found it convenient to carry slung over the left shoulder, a large napkin, to serve the various purposes of their ministry: thus both as a public speaker, and an attendant at the altar, the deacon preserves his stole; which however has now, like that of his superior, become ornamented, and is useful only for distinction, for mystic instruction, and evidence of ancient usage.

The people of Dalmatia did not use the trabea; their robe of state did not reach so low, it was opened at the sides which terminated in angles, it had wide sleeves moderately long, and frequently two or three large and rich tassels hung from behind the shoulders of the wearer. This dress, generally known, because of the country in which it was chiefly used, as the dalmatic, was for distinction assigned to the first attendant at the altar. The deacon's outer vestment, was decorated in front with two narrow stripes, *angusticlavi*, which were the appropriate ornaments of the robe of state worn by Roman knights, or the equestrian order; these were also continued on the back. Latterly, in most instances, the difference of colour has vanished, and only the embroidery is retained; in many places also the original appearance of the clavi even in the embroidery has been lost. The duty of deacon is to proclaim the Gospel, to prepare the offerings, to assist at the sacrifice, and to aid at giving the communion.

The sub-deacon is the next assistant; it is his duty to chaunt the epistle, to aid the deacon in preparing the sacred vessels for the sacrifice, to minister to him the wine and water, and assist in such other ways as may be necessary. He is not entitled to wear a stole, and his outer vestment is a tunic; this is generally made of an inferior silk, it was narrower than the dalmatic, the sleeves were also somewhat shorter and straighter, nor had it any clavus or embroidery; but within some centuries the two vestments have gradually become so much assimilated

that very little, if any difference can at present be perceived between the tunic and the dalmatic.

The other attendants are; a clergyman in a surplice, who is styled master of ceremonies; his duty is to see that everything be performed with decency, to suggest, if necessary to any other officer, what should be done, and to keep generally, in a situation sufficiently convenient to the celebrant, to aid by a suggestion, and to procure what may be wanting.

Two acolyths, or attendants of a lower order, are also in surplices, and carry lights before the celebrant, when he proceeds to the sanctuary, and before the deacon when he goes to announce the Gospel. Another acolyth is thurifer or incense bearer; he has charge of the censer in which is the lighted charcoal, and generally of a box shaped like an ancient boat, in which the incense is kept, together with a spoon to convey it to the censer.

The sacristan who has charge of the vestments, vessels, and other appurtenances of the sanctuary, also attends in a surplice: his place is near a small table called the credence, which is not distant from the altar at the right hand side, or that which in ecclesiastical language would be called at present, the epistle side, or south side. Upon this table the chalice stands, upon the mouth of which is a small linen cloth called a purifier, because it is used in cleansing and drying this vessel; over this is the patten or small plate containing the bread for consecration. This bread is unleavened, because it is believed, that such was that used by the Saviour at the institution, which occurred at the Paschal time when it was unlawful to have leavened bread, or to keep leaven in the dwelling. Yet though the great majority of the Catholic world follow this discipline, which they have preserved from the most ancient times, they do not condemn the few churches in their communion, which also following the very early practice of their ancestors, use leavened bread for the same purpose. A small card covered with cloth, or the cloth itself made very stiff, is placed over the bread, and the whole is covered with a rich silken veil. Upon the same table are the cruets which contain the wine and water, the books of the epistles and gospels, an ewer, basin and water for the washing of the fingers, and frequently a crucifix, with a pair of candles, also a burse or silk case, generally embroidered, which contains the corporal or cloth that is placed over the ordinary coverings of the altar, and upon which the chalice and Host rest. The name of this cloth is derived from the word *corpus* which signifies a body, for upon it reposes the body of the Lord, after the consecration.

When a bishop or other prelate entitled to use the pontifical dress

officiates, he wears not only the vestments of a priest, but also the tunic and the dalmatic; to show that he possesses the orders and powers of the sub-deacon and deacon, and that theirs are derived from him as their source. Besides, it was usual for those who wore the trabea in the days of the emperors, to wear on state occasions a tunic, and frequently a dalmatic under it. The bishop does not bring the stole across his breast, because he wears a golden cross depending in front, the hollow of which is filled with relics: for he is one of the patrician order of the church, and this ornament is substituted by him for the bulla worn by the nobles of ancient Rome, which was a golden ball in which it is said by some, they kept family memorials depending from their necks. The Christians, especially the clergy, were from the earliest period, attached to the cross and fond of wearing it. If we adopt the explanation here given, we shall see that the glory of this Christian nobility is the perfection of their virtue, the dignity of their divine institution, being placed by the Holy Ghost bishops to govern, according to his sacred ordinance, that church which the Saviour Jesus Christ purchased with his blood, and the lofty nature of their important commission, by which they are ministerially associated to himself by the Son of God in the reconciliation of a fallen world to a merciful Creator. Their family is the household of the faith, and they preserve with pious veneration the relics of the Apostles, the martyrs, the confessors, the virgins, and other sanctified beings whose religious achievements fill the brilliant pages of its history.

Whilst the bishop reads the preparatory psalms, sandals corresponding with the vesture of the day are put upon his feet by the attendants; after which divesting himself of his usual outer mantle or cappa, he is robed in the vesture for the holy sacrifice; previously however to which, he washes his fingers, not only that they may be free from any soil, but chiefly to remind him of the purity required for the occasion. He entreats the Lord to bestow upon him the aid necessary for this purpose; he wears gloves, at the putting on of which he prays that his iniquities may be hidden from the face of the Lord by the merits of the Saviour; so that like another Jacob, having his hands covered with the skins of kids, he may, in the person of this first born, receive in the covenant of grace, by his father's benediction, an everlasting inheritance. His mitre which is clearly from its shape and name, of eastern origin, has depending from its back two fillets by which formerly it was secured on the head, they being for this purpose brought round and tied under the chin. Being open and pointed at the top, it has been usually considered emblematic of the intellectual decoration of the prelate's head, the rich

knowledge of the pages of both testaments, in which so many precious examples of varied virtue blend their lustre with the tissue of the sacred history. It is not only a protection to him who is thus decorated, but also renders him a formidable adversary to the enemies of truth. The ring with a precious gem, which he wears on the third finger of his right hand, is the token of the fealty which he owes to the chaste Spouse of Christ, and of the obligation by which he has engaged to protect the purity of her doctrine and the perfection of her morality, with a holy jealousy, and an unceasing vigilance.—Should he officiate within his own district, his cross is exposed and he carries his crosier, which is not merely a staff to exhibit the divine aid upon which he relies for support, but it is also a shepherd's crook to testify that he is the pastor to whose care are confided those sheep which he is to feed with the pastures of heavenly doctrine and sacramental institutions on earth; that so prepared they may be brought above into the fold of the Great Shepherd, whose humble representative he is here below.

A priest, wearing a cope over the surplice, assists also when the bishop officiates solemnly. This cope is peculiar to no order; it is a large mantle, generally of silk, having a deep cape behind; this part is usually trimmed with a heavy fringe; the cope is fastened on the breast with clasps, and is sometimes embroidered on the front of the edges after the manner of the *laticlavus* of the ancient Romans. If the celebration be in a cathedral or in a collegiate church, the canons, of other members of the communities attached thereto, attend in their proper places, and appropriate dresses, which vary in different countries. However, they are in most places accustomed to wear furs of some description in winter, which they lay aside in summer.

It will immediately suggest itself to the reader of this brief outline, that nothing can be more unfounded than the strange notions sometimes entertained respecting the vesture of the Catholic clergy, by those who knowing absolutely nothing of its origin or object, censure it, having been irrationally and capriciously introduced by folly or despotism for the purpose of superstition or fraud. When such writers as Mr. Addison so egregiously exhibit their total want of information upon topics of which they venture to treat with even magisterial authority, we cannot but regret the absurdities into which they have been led. It has been the misfortune of many such men, that they were too proud to learn, and too poorly informed to understand our ceremonial; they were too self-sufficient to suspect their want of knowledge, and too well convinced that the great bulk of their readers had no opportunity of detecting their errors. The spirit of their country in their age was that

of arrogance and contempt in regard to every observance of the ancient church of Christendom: no matter what was its origin, what its venerable antiquity, what its classic illustration, what its religious instruction, what the lessons of piety that the practice or the vesture inculcated, or the devotional feeling it was calculated to excite, it was to be decried and depreciated. Every one knows, that ridicule costs less trouble than does critical or antiquarian research and literary refutation; besides, it is equally powerful against truth as against error, and produces its effects more generally and more rapidly upon the minds of the thoughtless and the uninformed. Thus it was an easier task for the enemies of our church to cast obloquy upon our ceremonial, than to disprove its claim to veneration. And to day we can, by simply observing the conduct of those who may touch upon the subject, easily distinguish the uninstructed and the religious, from the untaught, the rude, and the profane.

It will also be perceived, that however wide the distinction that at present exists between the sacred vesture and the ordinary popular dress, the difference was not originally worth observing. That used in the churches, by the ministers of religion, was indeed of a finer texture, of a more splendid tissue, and decorated with becoming ornament. The incursions of barbarian hordes, the varying fashions of capricious taste, together with a variety of other circumstances, wrought hundreds of changes, through hundreds of years, in the garments of worldly guise; whilst amidst this fluctuation of modes, the church, desirous as far as may be, in all things to assimilate the sameness of her customs to the unchangeableness of her doctrine, retained around her altars her clergy in their scarcely changed costume. Thus in her ancient temples which have existed for a thousand years, the eye of the observer will detect the most striking resemblance between the representations of her ancient hierarchy, in the mosaics and frescoes which decorate their domes and walls, and the garb of their successors who occupy those seats once filled by them. In those choirs which resounded to their voices so many centuries ago, the same praises are now heard, in the same language, to the eternal God, consonant to the unaltered faith which has been thus transmitted changeless itself through so many changing generations. At this intermediate point our great forefathers in religion might have stood, viewing the companions of the Apostles as we regard themselves; and contemplating the liturgies received from them, be consoled as we are, by the evidence with which they are replete. With them and with the great Apostle of nations, we could indulge ourselves in the rich consolation afforded by the reflection, that Jesus Christ,

is yesterday, to-day, and always the same. The doctrines of God are not like the opinions of man that they should change; his institutions are not like the devices of men that they should need amendment; the preservation of the ancient ways, is the avoiding of those novelties against which the great Teacher gave such emphatic caution. The founders of our church raised its superstructure upon the basis of the Gospel, and though an angel from heaven were to offer us any other, we should reject the proposal.

Previously to entering upon a view of the ceremonial of the mass, a few remarks on the structure of the church will be useful, as without an exact idea of its several parts, it would be somewhat difficult to understand the terms occasionally used in the explanation.

The present structure differs from the ancient.—The Church of St. Clement will give, perhaps, the best notion that can be obtained from any edifice now existing, of the figure of the ancient basilics or cathedrals.

The church was formerly, (and is now, where it can be done without great inconvenience) constructed so as to have its grand sanctuary at the eastern extremity: thus the worshippers prayed with their faces to that quarter where after the darkness of night the sun rose in splendour; by which they exhibited the belief and hope which they cherished of a glorious ressurrection from the shades of death; thus too, the Christians of the West turned towards the land of Judea, marked by the footsteps and miracles of the Saviour; towards Bethlehem, where angels chaunted the praises of the new born Emanuel, to shepherds rapt in adoration; towards that Jordan, on whose banks the last of the greatest of the prophetic train, pointed out to astonished multitudes, that Lamb who came to take away the sins of the world, whilst the Almighty Father proclaimed his eternal generation, and the mystic dove overshadowed that head yet reeking from the consecrated stream; towards Thabor, where the Son of man beaming forth those rays which he emitted before the day-star was created, shed upon the meek son of Aram and the hoary Thesbite, angelic effulgence, whilst the favoured Apostles entreated permission to remain upon the sacred spot; towards Jerusalem itself, that city of so many affecting recollections, that scene of nature's convulsion at the Saviour's death, that place of his triumphant resurrection, where the veil of the temple was rent, and where the vast foundations of the mighty edifice of our institutions were laid; towards Olivet, whose clouds seem to the lingering pilgrim transparent veils before the gates of heaven; towards that region where tongues of celestial fire gave to the apostolic band that glowing eloquence which

enlightened the world, and enkindled in so many hearts the flame of ardent charity. Thus in what would seem to the thoughtless a trifle; in that which the philosophist would affect to despise; or which might be even the subject of his jest for a buffoon; the wise fathers of the church, equally intimate with the great truths of religion, as with the avenues to the human heart, sought to establish lasting means for deeply imprinting upon the mind the knowledge of important facts, and of exciting the affections to a correct and enlightened, a warm and a pure devotion.

The eastern end of the middle aisle was semicircular, and the floor of its sanctuary was considerably elevated. In the centre, at the extremity, was the bishop's chair somewhat raised above the benches, which on either side continued around the curve; upon these at his right and left sat the priests. Immediately before him, but at some distance from the prelate, upon a platform raised two or three steps over the level of the sanctuary, and under a canopy supported by four pillars, was the altar; its front was towards the episcopal and presbyterial seats, its back towards the nave of the church. At the side of this altar, within the sanctuary, stood the deacons. The elevated platform, which extended from the eastern extremity to the range of the altar's back was separated from the other part of the church by *cancellæ* or rails, and was hence called the chancel, but more usually the sanctuary. From this, on either side of the altar, was a descent by three or four steps to the passage which intervened between it and the choir. This latter was an oblong parallelogram behind the altar, extending to a considerable distance into the nave, and elevated two or three steps above its level; it was by some called the ambo, though more correctly this was the name of its pulpit; it was inclosed by a low division, around which on the inside were benches for the sub-deacons and minor clergy; within it, generally at the side, were two or more pulpits, from which the epistles and gospels were chaunted, the lessons were read, and instructions were given. The entrance from the church to this choir was in the centre, at its western extremity; it was kept by a sub-deacon who admitted none but clergymen: at its eastern extremity was a corresponding door, which opened on the passage to the sanctuary. On the south or right hand side, the men who were admitted to communion occupied the space between the choir and the wall, those most venerable for age or station being in front; the females were on the northern side similarly arranged. The sacristy was on the side occupied by the men. The porters, who are the lowest order amongst the clergy, preserved regularity on this side; whilst the deaconesses performed the same duty amongst

the women. This separation of the sexes continued throughout the entire church. The faithful who were not admitted to communion, the more advanced catechumens, and strangers occupied the western extremity of the building, and the two latter were always required to withdraw at the end of the sermon, before the Mass of the faithful commenced. In the porch outside the church, the penitents who were excluded for their misconduct, begged the prayers of those who were permitted to attend the celebration of the mysteries.

During several centuries, the churches have, in general, gradually assumed a different aspect, and the strictness of their internal discipline has been considerably relaxed. The principal altar has been removed, in most instances, to where the prelate's chair was anciently placed; and this seat is on the northern side of the sanctuary; the vestry room or sacristy communicates immediately with the sanctuary on its southern side; the sanctuary itself has been enlarged, and the outer choir has disappeared; the front of the altar faces the congregation; of course the celebrant stands with his back towards the people; and not only is the separation between the faithful and strangers discontinued, but also that between the sexes. Yet, however, in many churches some vestiges of the ancient customs are found; a few of the high altars are built upon the old plan; the choir is in some places retained; and in others a different side of the church is occupied by men from that in which the women assemble.

In treating of the Mass we shall suppose ourselves in a church arranged according to the modern discipline; and the celebrant to be a priest attended by a deacon, a sub-deacon, two acolyths carrying large candle-stands, an incense bearer, a clergyman who is master of ceremonies, and another, a sacristan; we shall suppose the Mass to be solemnly celebrated, or what is usually called a High Mass, to distinguish it from the same office celebrated by a priest, attended merely by a clerk, and with less solemnity, generally without any music either vocal or instrumental.

Previously to the Mass, it is usual, in many places, to bless water, and to sprinkle it round the altar and upon the congregation; in other places it is blessed in the sacristy or vestry room, and placed near the entrance of the churches for the faithful to sprinkle upon themselves. The object of the ceremony is twofold: first, to obtain, through the merits of Christ and the public ministry of the church, the protection of God upon the place and the people; next, to excite in the faithful becoming dispositions by emblematic instruction, that they may be

rendered thereby more acceptable through the merits of their devoted and merciful Victim.

Some authors inform us that it was a custom in the East, previously to entering into the churches, to purify the hands and feet, and frequently the head, at large fountains which were constructed for this purpose in the front of the buildings; and that, as the body was thus freed from its impurities, they were admonished to reflect upon the necessity of having the soul also cleansed by the grace of God from all that could defile it, if they would enter in a becoming manner into his holy temple. In the whole of its extent, this statement is probably quite correct; it is not, however, a sufficient explanation. The prayers and the ancient testimonies lead us much further,—and the custom of using holy water is found in the earliest days of Christianity, not only in the East, but also in the West, where they made no such ablutions. St. Paul teaches us, in chapter viii, of his Epistle to the Romans, that not only the children of Adam fell, but every creature doomed for their service was made subject, against its will, to vanity; because that devil whom St. Peter describes (I. v.) as a roaring lion seeking for our destruction, as also his associates, strives to pervert all created things, and make them for us occasions of sin or of injury. We also learn from the doctor of the Gentiles (Ephes. i.), that not only has the Saviour procured for us, by his blood, the remission of our sins,—but that he has moreover willed, through his merits, to renew in himself and to rescue and restore what had thus been, in the lower heavens and on earth, subjected to those wicked spirits; and further, he shows us (*I Tim.* iv.) that those creatures over which they had obtained dominion, are sanctified by the word of God and by prayer. Hence, in order to exhibit the source of this renovation and sanctification to be the blessing of God, through the merits of our blessed Redeemer, nothing was more common amongst the first Christians, as our earliest writers inform us, than, when using anything, to pray for its sanctification through Christ, making at the same time, for this purpose, the sign of the cross.

The church, desirous of turning to spiritual account some of these creatures, has, from the very time of the Apostles, directed her public ministers to pray for their special sanctification,—and to use them, when thus blessed, as occasions to excite devotion and to procure the divine aid. Amongst these, one of the principal was water. Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and many other eminent authors of the best and purest ages of the church, give us abundant evidence on these points. Nor was this a novelty introduced

under the Christian dispensation; God himself had, in former times, established the principle. (*Num.* xix., and *Lev.* xiv. etc).

Water cleanses from filth, and salt preserves from corruption: desirous of using those creatures for the sanctification of her people, of their temples, and of their dwellings, the church first sanctified the objects themselves by prayer and the word of God. Exorcism is an authoritative adjuration. Having placed the water and salt before the ordained minister of the sanctuary, she prescribed to him the form of exorcism by which, in the name of Christ, and by the power of God, he was with authority to command the wicked spirits no more to have influence or power over those creatures; nor, when we read the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and many other passages of the New Testament, can we doubt the efficacy of this exorcism. A prayer was added, beseeching the special influence of God for the sanctification of what had thus been exorcised. The salt was then thrice mingled with the water, each time in the form of a cross, under the invocation successively of the persons of the Holy Trinity; to raise the mind to confidence, that all which was sought for would be obtained from this triune God, through the merits of the Victim of Calvary. As Eliseus healed the waters of Jericho by casting salt into them, so that he was able to promise, in the name of the Lord, that they should no more cause sterility or death, but would bring life and fruit,—the clergyman prays, that, released from the influence of every evil spirit, and blessed by the powerful hand of God, this water may now sanctify the persons and places to which it shall be applied; bestowing upon them the life of grace, and causing them to bring forth the fruits of virtue—so that, being cleansed from iniquity, and preserved from all corruption of sin, they may be saved through Christ.

He then sprinkles the holy water round the altar and upon the people, using the antiphon. "Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed: thou shalt wash me, and I shall be made whiter than snow." The first verse of the fifteenth Psalm, "Have mercy on me, O Lord," and so forth, is then sung: the entire psalm is repeated by those present, in a low voice, or its sentiments of true repentance, without which no sin can be remitted, are mentally dwelt upon: after which the antiphon is repeated. Reasonable confidence is entertained, that persons attending with such dispositions, profit greatly by using this holy water, because they are in a state which fits them to partake of the blessings, to obtain which the prayers have been offered.

During the Easter time, the antiphon refers to the effects of bap-

tismal water, which had been blessed on the Saturday before Easter day, and the congregation is excited to recollect the blessing conferred in the sacrament of baptism, to rejoice at having been made partakers thereof, and to be careful to preserve its fruits.

Under the old law, the blood of the victim was, by the direction of the Almighty, sometimes sprinkled upon the altar and the people, as it was at the making of the covenant, upon the book of the law and upon the congregation of Israel, to signify their union and holy alliance; so now in the Christian church does the sprinkling of the altar and of the flock, exhibit the new alliance between the Saviour and those who look for redemption by his blood.

When persons sprinkle themselves at going into the church, they should entertain the sentiments which befit this ceremony, and recollect that they ought to be cleansed from iniquity, and freed from the distractions of the world. It is one of the greatest misfortunes, when the faithful are found in the temple of the living God, at the solemn ordinances of religion, without a due conviction that where they stand is holy ground, that it is the palace of the king, that it is a terrible place, the gate of heaven made awful and sacred by the special presence of the Lord of hosts. Alas! they know it not. They thoughtlessly run through the ceremonial, without cherishing the spirit of the Church of Jesus Christ. They yield a full assent, it is true, to the lessons which are taught; but they are unmoved amidst so many occasions of solemn admonition, by which they are surrounded. Not only are they devoid of all fruit, but they are frequently rocks of scandal, equally destructive to others as they are barren in themselves.

Incense is used, not as a sacrifice, nor generally by way of adoration of God, in the ceremonies of the new law. It is offered as a token of respect, and is emblematically instructive, and calculated to excite devotion. Our writers are not agreed as to the time of its introduction for those purposes: some contend that it was not brought into our assemblies during the first three centuries; whilst others, and with perhaps, better reasons, assure us that it was always more or less generally used in the Christian church. In the old law, it was prescribed by God himself, and for the purpose of his worship; so it was amongst the gifts offered by the wise men to the Saviour at Bethlehem; and we have exceedingly respectable testimony of its having been burned in the churches, and at the altars of the Christians at a very early period. The ancient writers mention this practice, not as one of recent institution, or unusual, but seem to treat of it as a custom well known and long established. Nor is there the least semblance of evidence for the

assertion, that its introduction was rendered necessary by the damp and unwholesome vapours of the close or subterraneous places where the Christians offered their sacrifice, during the prevalence of persecution. The facts of which we have evidence, are altogether at variance with this notion.

The offerings, the altar, the relics, the prelates, the priests, the other clergy, and the faithful, are objects of veneration and respect, and these feelings are expressed by the use of incense. It is also emblematically instructive; for it teaches us how our prayers should ascend before the throne of grace, with acceptable fragrance to the most high and most merciful Lord; but for this purpose they must proceed from hearts rich and pure, in which the fire of divine love is enkindled, a fire which wholly consumes every earthly attachment that could separate us from the God of our affections. It teaches us also, how we should unite our aspirations with those of the saints mentioned by St. John in the Apocalypse (viii.), prayers which an angel offered as a rich odour from his censer, before the throne of the Eternal.

We now come to the Mass itself, which is composed of two distinct parts, viz: That of the Catechumens and that of the faithful. In order to have an accurate idea of this distinction, it is fit to know exactly who were catechumens. In the first ages of the church, those who desirous of knowing the Christian doctrine, or of being admitted into the Christian society, attended to hear instruction, were called Catechumens or hearers; they had to undergo a long and not unfrequently a severe trial, previous to being entrusted with the secrets, or having the confidence of the faithful. They had to rise from class to class through four stations, in each of which they must have been approved, before they were admitted to baptism. When they received this sacrament, they for the first time were instructed in the nature of the Eucharist, and the meaning and efficacy of the Mass. Up to this period it was unlawful for them to be present at the Holy Sacrifice; nor was any one of the faithful permitted to converse with them upon the subject. They were not even taught the creed nor the Lord's prayer, until the very eve of their baptism. In the first and a part of the second century, there were very few churches in which they were permitted to be present at any portion of the liturgy; but gradually they were allowed to assist at the first prayers, and at the instruction; but as soon as preparation was made for the offering, they were obliged to retire; then the deacons were placed in charge of the doors; the faithful were warned to recognise each other, and to be careful that no stranger attended. Subdeacons soon became the sentinels at one of the doors, and gradually

the persons entrusted with this post, were of lower orders till the porter had the office; and when, about the beginning of the eighth century, there were few, if any, unbaptized adults on that part of the continent of Europe where churches were built, this discipline fell into disuse, and there was no longer a distinct place for those who were merely hearers, because they were not Catechumens; all had been baptized, and were therefore entitled to enter, and to remain for the Sacrifice, unless they were excommunicated.

The Mass of the Catechumens then comprises the preparation at the foot of the altar, the introit and the succeeding parts, as far as the offertory. The Mass of the faithful commences by the offertory and continues to the end.

As the present explanation is not a critical disquisition, but a mere exposition to render our ceremonial intelligible to strangers, it is thought proper to omit the precise historical account of the introduction of the several portions of the Mass, the names of the pontiffs who regulated them, and the peculiar process by which they have acquired their present form. Yet a few general notions must be given upon some of these and similar points.

The Mass of the Catechumens, properly speaking, is only a preparation for the sacrifice. Formerly, that portion of it which was said at the foot of the platform, before ascending to the altar, was left in a great measure to the discretion of the celebrant; for after having vested himself in the sacristy, upon a signal given to the choir that he was ready, they commenced singing the introit or psalm at his entrance. During the chaunting of this, he came into the church, and there prayed, together with his attendants, at first in whatsoever manner his devotion suggested, but subsequently, the several churches adopted such forms as to each seemed best; some using one psalm and some another; but all having a like object, and each adopting also some form of confession. In these several forms there is found a very striking similarity, but the greater number of the Western churches have long since conformed in this respect to the usage of Rome; yet some of very ancient standing, have, with due permission, retained their old forms, and some of the religious orders, that were founded in those churches, have also preserved their peculiar customs.

Bowing down at the foot of the platform, with his attendants ranged on their side, the priest is filled with an ardent desire of ascending to the altar of his God, there to perform his solemn duty, but deterred by a sense of his own unworthiness, by reason of his manifold offences, he dreads to approach; he confesses his criminality to God, to the heavenly

host, and to his surrounding brethren, and beseeches that the angels, the saints, and his brethren, would intercede for him with their merciful Creator, relying upon whose grace, he will venture to perform the work of the ministry.

He therefore commences in the name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, making the sign of the cross, by putting his right hand to his forehead, then to his breast, then to his left and right shoulders, to show, according to ancient usage, that all his expectations are founded upon the merits of Him who died for us upon the cross. He then with his attendants, recites an antiphon taken from the *Psalm* (xiii.) *Judica me Deus*, together with a portion of the psalm itself. Antiphon means opposed voices. At a very early period, the custom was introduced into the assemblies of the faithful, of dividing the attendants into two parts, and by alternate or opposed voices, chaunting or reciting psalms and hymns; a particular verse or passage which had special reference to the solemnity of the day, was selected to be sung before and after the psalm, so as to keep the mind more fully occupied therewith; and by degrees this selection obtained, by way of pre-eminence, the name of antiphon. This psalm now used at the foot of the platform, was written by David when he was absent from his country, to avoid the wrath of Saul; it breathes the fervent longings of the exile for an opportunity of worshipping at the altar of his God, in the midst of the solemnities of his people. It is therefore peculiarly appropriate for expressing the sentiments of the priest who goes to offer the eucharistic sacrifice. The antiphon is: "I will go up to the altar of God; to God who bestows joy upon my youth." This only is now recited, though formerly several were sometimes read by the celebrant; like all others, it is concluded with the doxology of "Glory be to the Father," and so forth, which there is reason to believe was received from the Apostles. After the doxology, the antiphon is repeated, and the priest, bowing down still lower, confesses himself to be a sinner, striking his breast as did so many of the penitents mentioned in the Scriptures; he then intreats the intercession of the church triumphant and militant in his behalf; his attendants beseech God to have mercy upon him; he then stands erect whilst they, bowing down in the attitude of humility and supplication, confess in turn their criminality, and request the like intercession, as also his prayers on their behalf. He having besought in like manner for them, as they did for him, the mercy of God, they now stand erect and sign themselves again with the cross, to show the source of their hope of mercy, whilst he prays for perfect pardon and remission of their sins. He next expresses, in scriptural extracts, the joy and consolation which

is expected from that mercy which the Lord has promised; and now ascends to the altar praying that God would take away their iniquities so that they may go up with pure minds to the holy place. When he has concluded the confession, if he be a bishop, the maniple is put upon his left hand. The custom is preserved as a testimony of ancient usage; for until he was to ascend to the altar, the trabea or chasuble previously to its assuming the present form, covered him on every side, coming over his arms and hands: but after the confession, it was raised at the sides, to afford him greater liberty, and then the mappula or maniple was attached to his left arm. When he is going up, the deacon and sub-deacon also hold the edges of his vestment at the sides, this being the relic of the ancient custom of keeping it raised previously to its being cut into the shape it now bears.

The psalm *Judica* is one calculated to banish sorrow and grief, and to excite joy; it is, therefore, omitted in Masses for the dead, when mourning is united to supplication, and in the Masses of the time which intervenes between the eve of Passion Sunday, a fortnight before Easter, and the Saturday before Easter day, because of the affliction which should overwhelm the faithful children of the church at this period, when she leads them to contemplate the sufferings of her beloved Spouse. But it is recited in the Masses of any festivals that might be celebrated even within that time. Having arrived at the altar, the celebrant kisses it through respect; if he be a bishop, he kisses the book of gospels: on other occasions throughout the Mass, he kisses the altar in the same manner as is customary for a priest. The prayer for either is the same; the deacon and the sub-deacon bend their knees as they attend him on either side during this salutation.

His prayer is to intreat God that in regard to the merits of those saints whose relics are there contained, as also of his other saints, he would vouchsafe to extend his mercy to lessen the temporal punishment that might yet remain due to the sins of him who ventures to approach. These prayers are said in an under tone of voice; because, in the first place, they regard principally the individual himself, and also because they are repeated whilst the choir sings the introit, and of course it would be useless for him to raise his voice. Previously to his ascent he had also, as it were, taken leave of the people by the salutation from the sacred Scriptures of *Dominus vobiscum*, or "The Lord be with you," to which the answer was given, upon the principle of St. Paul (*II Tim.* vi. 22,) and as received from the days of the Apostles. *Et cum spiritu tuo.* "And with thy spirit."

Perhaps it will not be considered here amiss to explain very briefly

the doctrine of the church respecting the extensive knowledge, the intercession and the merits of the saints; as it is more than probable that several who may read this little compilation have exceedingly inaccurate notions upon the subject; and although they may not be induced to change their opinions respecting the correctness of our belief and practice, still it is desirable that they should distinctly know what they too often censure without examination.

The doctrine is expressed in this simple phraseology, "I believe that the saints, reigning together with Christ, may be honoured and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be respected."

As the church does not announce to us any distinct proposition expressing the manner in which these disembodied spirits become acquainted with the wants or wishes of their fellow-worshippers on earth, we may form our own conjectures as we please upon that subject; she only testifies, at the very utmost, first, that they may be invoked; and, secondly, that they offer prayers to God for us; from which premises it is reasonable to conclude that they become acquainted with our invocation. It is objected that for this purpose they should possess the attribute of ubiquity, or that of omniscience, or both; and that this would at once make them equal to God. The answer is exceedingly simple. First: that to be present upon this earth and in heaven is not to be everywhere present; supposing, therefore, this former restricted presence required, however absolutely extensive it might be, it would be an extravagant enlargement of phraseology to style it ubiquity. Again, it would be equally ridiculous, to call a knowledge of what is sought for by a limited number of those who dwell upon this circumscribed spot in the midst of the vast universe, omniscience. Hence, upon the supposition that the saints have a natural power of knowing who invoke them, and also what is sought for by each, it would be grossly absurd to assert that they are therefore gifted with ubiquity or with omniscience. But if we believe that it is in the power of God to make known to them who are their suppliants, and also the nature of the requests made; we surely do not by that belief of this divine manifestation derogate from the Almighty, nor too greatly raise the prerogatives of a creature, whom he has bountifully saved, through the merits of Christ, and whom he has mercifully admitted to enjoy that beatific vision which St. Paul describes: (*I Cor.* xiii. 12,) "But then I shall know even as I am known." Another objection is indeed a wretched semblance of natural philosophy: by which it is asserted that the saints are too far removed to hear us. The principle which is here assumed is a pal-

pable mistake, viz., that the laws by which disembodied spirits become acquainted with the wishes of others, are the same as those to which they were subject while they were united to their bodies; whereas, having left those bodies in the grave, they no longer see through the eye, nor hear through the ear: but are equal to the angels. (*Luke* xx. 26.) To argue, therefore, an impossibility of hearing by reason of distance, is indeed a despicable sophism. A great many passages of the sacred volume exhibit to us the knowledge which angels have of the children of Adam, and show how it reaches even to the heart itself; the Saviour informs us (*Luke* xv. 7, 10) of the joy that is in heaven and before the angels, upon a sinner's conversion. If the saints be equal to the angels, they have, of course, this knowledge.

The doctrine, as has been remarked, does not require for its support that we should be able to explain the mode by which our supplications become known, nor even to prove, in fact, that they do become known to the saint. It would be sufficient that this, our fellow-servant, now secured in glory through the redemption of Christ our only Saviour, should offer prayers to God, generally, on behalf of all those who implored his intercession. The questions of a proper and becoming honour to this friend of God, and to his relics, being left out of view, our doctrine is then reduced to two propositions. First, that we may lawfully call upon the saints reigning together with Christ to pray to God on our behalf; that is, to intercede for us. Secondly, that they do offer prayers to God for us. Respecting the first, it is often thoughtlessly asserted that by invoking them we place them upon a level with God, and are, therefore guilty of idolatry. Catholics will, indeed, be justly liable to that charge when they shall have placed the saints upon a level with God; but, in order to do so, they must address both in the same language, having the same meaning. They ask the saints to pray for them to God; but they have never, even by their most dishonest opponent, been charged with asking God to pray for them to a saint. They ask of God as the giver of every good gift, for mercy, because it is His prerogative to condemn or to acquit by His own right, without deriving His commission from another; and to grant mercy or to withhold it, because not only there is no one more high, but it would be blasphemy to assert that he had an equal. They call upon the saints, as creatures far, immeasurably far below Him who created, who redeemed, and who made them holy to pay to him the homage of their prayer, by uniting their petitions to ours whilst they intercede on our behalf.

It is said that by making the saints mediators between God and us, we destroy the distinction between Jesus Christ and those creatures; that

we make them equal to Him whom the sacred Scriptures exhibit clearly to be our only mediator, our only intercessor. Upon so serious and important a subject, a mere play upon words would be unpardonable sophistry; we avow the full force of the scriptural expressions, when we profess that Jesus Christ, the only son of God, is our only Saviour, our only Redeemer, the only Mediator who, by His death, paid the ransom for our offences, the only Intercessor who pleads for us by claiming, as His own right, that mercy which He purchased by His bloody sacrifice, and promised to extend to the true penitent. If, then, we mention other intercessors, we do not intend the word to have the same meaning when used in their regard, as it has when applied to Him; in like manner as when we speak of God our benefactor, we clearly do not intend to bring Him down to a level with our earthly benefactors, or to raise them to an equality with Him. St. Paul besought the prayers and intercession of those servants of God with whom he conversed, as also those to whom he wrote; nor did he thereby undervalue the efficacy of the Saviour's intercession, but he felt the truth which St. James recorded (v. 16, and so forth) "that the continual prayer of a just man availeth much." This intercession of the just by prayer through the merits of the Redeemer is one of the effects of their charity, for even when faith and hope are lost, after death, in the fruition of happiness, charity not only remains, but is made perfect, so that the prayers of those saints who are decorated therewith, are indeed sweet odours and incense acceptable in heaven. (*Apoc.* v. 8; viii. 3, 4.) and so forth. Jesus Christ is the only mediator who reconciled His Father to the guilty world; He is the only intercessor who, in his own name, pleads on our behalf. Others ask in His name, and only through the efficacy of His atonement.

Still a greater apparent difficulty is to be encountered in some other expressions; such as making the request through the merits of the saints. Had words but one precise meaning without any latitude, this would, indeed, be an expression highly censurable and grossly offensive to pure religion. The fact is, however, quite otherwise; the poverty of language is such, that most words have great extension, and the above phrase has quite a different meaning when used respecting Jesus Christ, from what it has when used in regard to any saint, even His blessed Virgin Mother. Merit signifies desert, or claim to recompense. Probably the doctrine of the church will be more easily explained by similitude. We shall suppose some mighty work to be performed, and that only one individual exists who has the means and the power necessary for its execution. As its achievement would be exceedingly beneficial, a great recompense is offered by a benevolent being in return for the

performance. He who alone is capable effects it, and he alone can therefore claim the recompense, yet though the merit is solely and exclusively his, he can, if he thinks proper, admit others to its participation, either gratuitously or by assigning them certain tasks, for the performance of which he conveys to them a right to claim and to receive in his name and on his account, a portion of the great reward to which he alone is entitled. They have thus a claim derived from him; they have no proper original independent merit of their own, but they clearly have a dependent, or derivative merit, and through his kindness their claim has become indefeasible. Thus the Saviour, having by His great atonement taken away the handwriting of sin and death that stood against us, and established claims for our eternal salvation, made us partakers of His merits by His own benevolence and mercy, and places in our power greater benefits, upon the condition of our doing what He requires. Were all to be merely saved from hell and placed upon an equality of glory and happiness, there would be no ground for our doctrine of derived merit beyond that of being saved; but the Saviour himself informs us that in His father's house there are many mansions; (*John* xiv. 2,) and St. Paul tells us that in the resurrection there will be a variety of degrees of glory. (*I. Cor.* xv. 41,) and so forth. Not only is this founded upon the common principle of distributive justice, but the Saviour Himself exhibits to us the basis upon which it rests, (*Matt.* x. 41, 42,) where he describes a diversity of rewards of works, and shows that not even the least merit will be overlooked, not even that of giving a cup of cold water to a little one in the name of a disciple; and therefore He declares (*Matt.* xvi. 27) that at the day of judgment He will render to every man according to his works.

The church then does not teach that any saint has original, underived merit. This is to be found only in the Saviour who justified them: calling them by His grace to faith and to repentance, aiding them, when they answered this invitation, to bring forth worthy fruits of penance, applying to them the merits of His atonement by means of His sacramental and other institutions, and then when through his grace they were justified, He enabled them to do works pleasing to His Father, and deserving a recompense through the claims of their Redeemer, and by the merciful regulation of their bountiful God, who crowns in His saints, those works which He gave them power to perform, and to the performance of which He was pleased to attach a recompense. These are then, in our view, the merits of the saints; far different indeed from those of Jesus Christ not only in their origin, but in their mode of performance and in their value. Yet however poor they may be in com-

parison with those of the Son of God: in our regard they are great and valuable. These servants of God are now his favourite children, he regards them with complacency, he willingly hears them and has respect to the virtues which through Jesus Christ they practised, as he had respect formerly to the entreaties of Moses, (*Exod.* xxxii. 10, 13, 14,) where the intercessor for Israel himself referred to the merits of the deceased patriarchs. When therefore the prayer of our liturgy mentions the merits of the saints, the phrase is to be understood in the sense here explained, as distinguishing them from the merits of Christ.

Another doctrine has also been alluded to in the foregoing exposition, upon which it may be well to make an observation. The expression was "to lessen the temporal punishment that might remain due to the sins," and so forth. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that no sin ever was or can be forgiven, except by the power of God, through the merits of Christ, and upon the condition of repentance in a person having the use of reason. Besides this, she teaches that the Almighty might require any conditions He thought proper, to be fulfilled on the part of the penitent, for repentance creates no claim of strict justice upon the benevolence of the Creator. We must therefore seek in the positive institutions of the Saviour, and not in our own speculative conjectures for the conditions which have been established. The Saviour did not change the great principle of God's providence which existed from the beginning, when in regard to the penitent he abrogated the sacrifices for sin that were required under the Mosaic dispensation, and instituted the sacramental observances of the new law in their stead.

At all times the Lord reserved to himself the right of either bestowing a full remission of the punishment due to the delinquent when he blotted out his guilt upon his doing penance; or of substituting a temporal affliction for that which was in its nature eternal, and which St. Paul declares to be the wages of sin (*Rom.* v.); and we find a vast number of instances in the sacred volume which exhibit him actually remitting the eternal punishment, whilst through the merits of the Saviour he removed the guilt, yet inflicting at the same time a temporal penalty. One explanatory instance will suffice, though very many might be adduced. In the second book of Kings, or as it is sometimes called of Samuel, we have an affecting example in the twelfth chapter. David had for some time remained negligent in his criminality; had he died in this state he must necessarily have been condemned for ever: but the Lord who regarded him in mercy, sent Nathan to address him in that beautiful parable which so roused the indignation of the monarch against that man whose cruelty and injustice were described, that he declared

"As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this is a child of death." The prophet then announced to him "Thou art the man." "Thou hast killed Urias the Hittite with the sword of the children of Ammon," and "thou hast taken his wife to be thy wife!" Struck with remorse, and aided by divine grace, the king of Israel repented; and confessing, he said to Nathan, "I have sinned." The remission of his guilt followed, for the messenger of heaven announced to him, "the Lord also hath taken away thy sin," and of course, with the removal of the stain of guilt, the eternal punishment was remitted, "Thou shalt not die." But a temporal affliction was substituted. "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing, the child that is born to thee shall surely die." This is by no means a singular instance; the sacred volume, both in the Old and New Testament exhibits it to us as the ordinary proceeding of the Lord. Yet, from the same source, we also learn that he is exceedingly merciful, and that, upon entreaty and supplication, upon the performance of works of voluntary mortification in a penitent spirit, he will often, having regard to the superabundant merits of the Redeemer, greatly diminish or altogether remit this temporal penalty. Thus David, who knew his providential course, "besought the Lord for the child," he kept a fast, and going in by himself lay upon the ground. In strains of sorrow he bewailed his crime. "O Lord rebuke me not in thine indignation, by casting me off for ever from thy mercy, nor chastise me in thy wrath, by the severe though transient punishment which thou dost impose, even when thou hast admitted the sinner to pardon. Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am weak, heal me, for my bones are troubled, I have laboured in my groanings, every night I will wash my bed, I will water my couch with tears." (*Ps.* vi.) "For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me, I am turned in my anguish whilst the thorn is fastened in me. I have acknowledged my sin to thee, and my injustice I have not concealed. I said, I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord; and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin." (*Ps.* xxxi.) "Wash me yet more from my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin, for I know my iniquity, and my sin is always before me." (*Ps.* vi.) Yet on this occasion, the Lord did not relax the penalty; and the resigned penitent when he learned the death of the child, bowed in submission to his will; he had also to endure much more as a penance for the same crime, though its guilt and the eternal punishment had been taken away. Several instances might be pointed out in which the Lord, besought by prayer, remitted the entire or a part of this penalty: thus in *Exodus* xxxii. 14, after Moses had intreated him and also brought to his view

the merits of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel, "The Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people." In *Numbers* xii. 13, 14, upon the prayer of Moses, Mary had the suffering to which she was subjected, reduced to the duration of only seven days. In the same book (ch. xiv.,) when the Lord had sentenced the people to be consumed by a pestilence, (12,) Moses besought him, and (20) the Lord forgave, but yet (23) upon condition that they should never enter the land of promise. And chapter xv. of *Jeremias*, to show the hopelessness of the people's doom, the prophet records, "And the Lord said to me: if Moses and Samuel shall stand before me, my soul is not towards this people: cast them out from my sight, and let them go forth." From the examples here referred to, the doctrine of the church respecting the merits of the saints, their intercession and its efficacy may be easily understood; as also her doctrine respecting the remission of the temporal penalty which sometimes remains due to sin after the removal of the guilt, and the remission of eternal punishment. The diminution, or total remission of this temporal penalty, through the authoritative application of the superabundant merits of the Saviour and that of the saints in the manner above exhibited, is called an indulgence, either partial or plenary. The reader may thus at once perceive the gross injustice of the charge so often made against the church, that by granting indulgences, she gives a license to commit sin.

Let us return to the Mass. After the salutation of the altar, the deacon gives incense to the celebrant, kissing, through respect, the spoon and the hand which receives it: after casting the incense upon the fire in the censer, and returning the spoon, the celebrant makes the sign of the cross over the smoking perfume, praying thus, "Mayest thou be blest by him in whose honour thou art burned;" then taking the censer from the deacon, he perfumes the cross and the altar; at the conclusion of which ceremony, the deacon, receiving back the thurible, exhibits his respect for the celebrant by incensing him. Having returned the censer to the acolyth who has it in charge, the deacon, followed by the sub-deacon, goes up to attend the priest whilst he reads the introit, which the choir has sung at his entrance. The book is placed for this purpose at the epistle side of the altar; that is, on the left hand of the crucifix, which in a regularly built church is on the south side, or that of the sacristy.

The introit is generally a psalm appropriate to the solemnity, but sometimes it is taken from some other portion of the Old Testament, for now this side of the altar may be considered as the place in which the prophetic declarations, the aspirations of the patriarchs, and the other

testimonies of the great fathers who preceded the incarnation are proclaimed. At reading the antiphon, the celebrant and his attendants make the sign of the cross upon themselves: but in Masses for the dead it is made rather towards the book, as emblematic of their desire to have the merits of Him who was crucified applied to remove any temporal punishment, that may still remain against the deceased, if he be so happy as to have the guilt and the eternal punishment of his sins remitted. Instead of the doxology, the usual prayer for the dead, which in this Mass is the antiphon, is repeated, "Eternal rest grant them, O Lord. And let perpetual light shine unto them." When this praise of the Trinity is repeated, the clergy bow their head toward the crucifix upon the middle of the altar.

The name *ad Introitum*, or at the entrance, is appropriately given to this, because it was originally chaunted at the entrance of the people and the clergy, and was continued until they were all in their proper places.

The celebrant in the ancient monastery of Bec, in Normandy, retained for a long time the custom of not taking the maniple until the conclusion of this part of the office; from what has been written, the reader will easily perceive the reason.

The mystic writers give us two accommodations of this portion: first, that it represents the entrance of the Saviour into the world by his incarnation. Again, that it should remind us of his entrance into the garden of Gethsemani, to begin his sufferings. The pious attendant at the Holy Sacrifice may with advantage indulge both reflections.

After the *introit*, the choir chaunts the Kyrie eleison, thrice, in honour of the Eternal Father; Christie eleison, thrice, to the honour of his Eternal Son; and Kyrie eleison, thrice, in honour of the Holy Ghost. The celebrant and his attendants repeat the phrases of the invocation alternately, at the corner of the altar, in a low voice. This is a Greek supplication for mercy. Lord have mercy on us, Christ have mercy on us. It is of very ancient standing. As the church consisted of various nations, having different languages and rites, of which, next to Latin, Greek and Hebrew were the most extensively used, the Western church, as a token of perfect communion in faith and government, used some of their phrases in her liturgy: of the Hebrew she had, Amen, Alleluia, Hosanno, and so forth, besides these and others of the Greek; and St. Augustin (Epis. 178) informs us that in his day, about the year 420, the Romans frequently used the Gothic phrase *sihora armen*, which means, Lord have mercy on us.

This custom was not established by any law, but gradually spread

itself through the Church. Neither was the time for repeating the Kyrie eleison, nor the number of repetitions, everywhere or always the same. The present form has been during centuries in use, and is well calculated to express the longing desire of those who felt the evil consequences of our first parents' transgression and of their own weakness, for the arrival of him who alone could release them from their thraldom. This is supposed to have been originally introduced for the catechumens, and retained by the faithful through devotion.

On festivals, the angelical hymn of *Gloria in excelsis*, Glory be to God in the highest, and so forth, is chaunted: the celebrant leading, and the whole choir following, by immediately taking up the sacred strain. But it is omitted on Sundays, in times of penance, on ferial days, except in Easter time, and in Masses for the dead. It was formerly usual, in many churches, for the deacon to repeat several forms of prayer for public necessities on the days of penance, in place of this hymn. The antiquarians and rubricians are by no means agreed as to the author of the additions made to what the angels sung on the night of our Lord's nativity. (*Luke* ii. 14.) All however are agreed, that though not introduced generally into the Mass, it was used as a form of praise and prayer from the most remote period of the Christian era. Pope Telesphorus, who presided over the church about the year 150, is thought to have been the first who ordered it to be sung at the Mass of Christmas day. The Greeks seem to have been greatly attached to it. Pope Symmachus, about three hundred and fifty years after Telesphorus, is said to have extended its use in the liturgy. But St. Gregory the Great, a century later, directed that it should be said in Mass by the priests only on the great festival of Easter; but by bishops on all Sundays and festivals. However, after the tenth century, it was also said by the priests on those days when it was said by bishops. In the church of Tours, there was an ancient custom of chaunting it on the festival of Christmas, at the first Mass in Greek, and at the second Mass in Latin. It is given also as a reason by some for the celebrant commencing, and the choir then joining, that it is mentioned in the second chapter of *St. Luke* (v. 9), that one angel only first appeared to the shepherds, and when he had communicated the joyful tidings, (v. 13,) suddenly there was with him a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God and saying, Glory be to God in the highest, and so forth.

Formerly, the celebrant read this hymn at the epistle side, after he had there chaunted the first notes. Now he goes to the middle of the altar as a more convenient place; he again, at the conclusion, makes the

sign of the cross, and generally goes with his attendants to sit during the time that the choir sings what he has read.

If a bishop celebrates pontifically in his own church, he reads the Mass of the Catechumens at his proper seat; or, if in the church of another bishop, at a seat prepared for him at the epistle side, below the platform of the altar. At the conclusion of the hymn also, turning towards the congregation, the bishop salutes them in the words, *Pax vobis*, "Peace be with you." This was the salutation of the Saviour, whose messenger and minister he is, to his Apostles, (*John* xx. 19, 21, and so forth,) and is very appropriately made after that solemn canticle by which, in the very words of angels, peace is proclaimed, through the celestial messenger, to men of good-will. This was peculiarly fit for the bishop, who, as we have seen, was the only one that in the Western church, except on the feast of Easter, recited this hymn in the Mass, until after the tenth century. Thus, whenever he repeats the hymn, he uses this mode of salutation: but, on other days, and at all other times in the Mass, his salutation is similar to that of the priest, *Dominus Vobiscum*, "The Lord be with you." Some western bishops were in the habit of substituting this *Pax Vobis*, for the *Dominus Vobiscum* upon all occasions, until the irregularity was checked by the Council of Braga, in the year 561. St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and other ancient writers, however, testify that the usual salutation of the Greek clergy was from the beginning, that which they still retain, "Peace be to all."

The priest kisses the altar, that he may receive the salute of affection from Christ, whom it represents; and then turning to the people, he communicates it to them. Their answer to the bishop or priest is the same, *Et cum spiritu tuo*, which has been previously explained.

Should the altar be built in the old fashion, as the celebrant has his face towards the congregation, the altar being between them, he does not turn, but merely expands his hands.

The *Gloria in excelsis*, having been omitted during Advent and Lent, when it is resumed at Christmas and Easter, it is in many places usual to ring the bells during its repetition, on the first and second day, as a token of joy.

After the salutation, the celebrant at the book calls the people to attention by inviting them to pray, in the phrase *Oremus*, "Let us pray," bowing to the crucifix as he gives the invitation; he then, with expanded hands, chaunts the prayers called collects, which are appropriate to the solemnity of the occassion, and are one or more, as the occasion requires.

The origin of the name collect is most ancient, but its derivation is not so clear; some of those given are, first, because it was a prayer for the collected assembly; again, because it was a prayer in which the faithful with collected desires united together; then, because it was a prayer which collected their necessities, and presented them before the throne of God. and so forth. In offering it, the celebrant, according to the direction of St. Paul, (*I Tim.* ii. 8), lifts up his hands, trusting that they are pure. This mode of holding the hands in public prayer was equally common under the old law, (*Ps.* xxvii. 2; *Ps.* cxxxiii. 2, and so forth), as it was in the first days of Christianity, though we find several very ancient evidences to show that the Christians were in many instances accustomed to pray with their hands extended in the form of a cross, as some religious orders yet practise.

Several of those collects have come from the time of the Apostles. There was at one period a license to the celebrant of making the prayer occasionally, according to his judgment and devotion; but this was sometimes so greatly abused that it was considerably restricted at an early period; and the third Council of Carthage, and the Council of Milevi, in 416, abrogated it altogether, forbidding any collects to be used, unless such as had been approved by the bishop or by a council. Pope Gregory the Great completed what Gelasius had begun: some have been added by succeeding pontiffs.

On days of penance, after the celebrant invited the flock to prayer, the deacon proclaimed, Let us kneel, *Flectamus genua*; and after some pause in secret prayer, he added, *Levate*, rise, after which the celebrant recited the collect: at present the subdeacon immediately says *Levate,* merely giving time for bending the knee; and at the end of the prayer the choir answers *Amen*, which is an aspiration of consent in the petition.

In the church of St. John of Lateran, it was for a long time customary to have no collect, but in its stead to repeat the Lord's prayer; whilst in other places it was usual to have five or seven collects, and in some churches, on special occasions, to add what they call Lauds, or prayers for the Pope, the emperor, and others in authority, after the whole number of collects had been gone through. After these prayers, the epistle is chaunted by the subdeacon, whilst the celebrant reads it in a low voice. The chaunt is the old style of solemnly reading documents of importance. The variety upon this head, also, was very great. At first the prophecies of the old law, especially those which referred to the solemnities of the day, were in some places read by the ordained reader; next followed a portion of the Mosaic law, or sacred history, after which an extract from the *Epistles of St. Paul*, or one of the other

canonical epistles, and not unfrequently some epistles which were never in the canon, as for instance that of St. Clement. At the conclusion of the last lesson a psalm or hymn was sung. As the Council of Laodicea (can. 59) forbade any lesson to be read, except from the inspired writings, and as those for the Sundays were selected from the *Epistles of St. Paul* and the other Apostles, this portion was long known by the name of *Apostolus*, and is so called by several ancient writers. As early as the time of St. Ambrose, the order of these lessons were settled in Italy. Gradually, after this period, the subdeacons began to take the place of the mere readers; and for a long time it has become the duty of this officer to chaunt the epistle, after which he goes to the celebrant with the book, and kneels to receive his blessing; he then rises, and gives the book either to the deacon or to the master of ceremonies, and the deacon places the book of the gospels on the altar; for now the same book contains the gospels and epistles.

The affection of the faithful and their veneration for the sacred Scriptures have always been exceedingly great; and the conduct of the church, arising from these sentiments, has been greatly misunderstood by several who do not examine. At the present day the spouse of Christ regards this sacred volume as one of the most precious deposits entrusted to her guardianship. She feels it to be her duty to preserve the context pure, entire, and unaltered—not only to preserve the words, but to testify their meaning—in discharge of the high commission of the Saviour. This is done, not by novel arbitrary interpretations, but by declaring what was always the sense in which the passages of the holy writ were understood by the Christian world. Hence she forbids her children to receive or to use any copies which have not been examined by competent authority; and thus, through the lapse of ages, and the convulsions of human institutions, notwithstanding the efforts of her adversaries, she has kept these venerable pages free from human corruption. She requires also of her children that they shall conform their minds to that meaning, which was received in the beginning with the books themselves, from their inspired compilers, and that they shall never interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of those fathers who in every age have given to us the uninterrupted testimony of this original signification. She knows of no principle of common sense, or of religion, upon which any individual could, after the lapse of centuries, assume to himself the prerogative of discovering the true meaning of any passage of the Bible to be different from that which is thus testified by the unanimous declaration of the great bulk of Christendom.

For this would in fact be a new revelation. If the vast majority of Christendom has been unanimous, and yet involved in continued error, upon what principle will a divided and discordant minority claim to be correct? If there be no certain and plain mode of knowing the meaning of the passages of the word of God, of what value is their possession? She cannot consent to place the great book of divine revelation upon a par with the riddles or enigmas of heathen oracles.

In her assemblies she proclaims the sacred writings in a dead and unchanging language, in which during ages they have been preserved, but she also allows exact translations in the vernacular tongues; she requires that they be frequently collated with this standard, and that they be explained by her commissioned expositors. Her pastors are not permitted to introduce opinions of their own, but they are bound before many witnesses to declare openly what had been openly placed in their keeping. The Persian, the Chinese, the Italian, the German, the American, and the Spaniard must agree in doctrine with the Numidian and the Moor, because the revelation of a God of truth must everywhere be consistent with itself. She calls the license to introduce new and discordant interpretations a sanction to disseminate error, and the propagation of error she looks upon to be the worst abuse of liberty.

When these lessons were read in her assemblies, their interpretation was also frequently given, but always under the control of the presiding bishop or priest, who was careful to prevent profane novelty of opinion.

The hymns or psalms which followed the epistle are generally called the "gradual," because the singers stood or sat upon the *gradus*, or steps of the pulpit. In times of penance the chaunt was slow and drawn out, and was therefore called *tractus*, or "tract." Others inform us that the original meaning of the word tract was not that here given, but that what was sung by only one person was so called; and that as it was considered more solemn and better befitting times of penance to have the chaunt by a single voice, what was selected on those occasions got this name. But when at other times the singer was occasionally interrupted by the choir, the parts he chaunted were called versicles, and the bursts of the chorus or choir were called responsories. In Easter times the responsories were generally "Alleluia," and sometimes frequently repeated. It was usual also amongst the Jews to chaunt this exclamation at their festivals of the Passover.

When the heart is full of joy, for the expression of which it cannot find words, an effort is frequently made to indulge the feelings by a sort of voluntary melodious repetition of notes. The Greeks call this πνευμα, *pneuma*, or "breathing;" and upon this principle the notes of

the Alleluia and some other short expressions are prolonged with harmonious variety, in times of great festivity. The name of sequence or following became peculiar to this.

About the year 880, Notker, a monk of St. Gall, in Switzerland, composed what is called a "prose," which was an expression in loose measure, yet such as might be sung, of the principal circumstances of the festival or solemnity, to be added to the pneuma, or adapted occasionally to its notes. He said that he found one in an antiphonary, brought by a priest from the Benedictine abbey of Junges, about fifteen leagues from Rome, and which had been burned by the Normans in 841, and was then in ruins, though it was rebuilt in 917. These proses became exceedingly numerous, and in some places even ridiculous, so that the Councils of Cologne in 1536, and of Rheims in 1564, directed their examination and retrenchment: only five are retained in the Roman Missal, one for Easter, one for Whitsuntide, the Lauda Sion, written by St. Thomas of Aquin for Corpus Christi, the *Stabat mater dolorosa,* and the greatly admired *Dies iræ* in Masses for the dead.

The book was now removed to the Gospel side, that is the side to the north or right hand of the crucifix, which is the left of the congregation, to show the translation of the law and authority from the Aaronitic to the apostolic priesthood; the celebrant, bowing in the middle of the altar, prays to the Lord to cleanse his lips and heart that he may worthily announce the sacred Gospel, after which he proceeds to read it, in a low tone of voice, whilst the choir continue their chaunt. At the conclusion he again puts incense into the thurible; the deacon repeats, on his knees, the Munda cor meum, or prayer preparatory to the Gospel, and going to the altar which represents Christ, he takes thence the book of the Gospels, to show whence this divine law had its origin: kneeling to the celebrant he requests his blessing, after having received which, he proceeds to chaunt the portion selected for the occasion. For as St. Paul writes in his Epistle to the Romans, (chap. x. 14, 15,) "How then shall they call on Him, in whom they have not believed? or how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach unless they be sent? As it is written. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things."

The deacon having thus received his mission from superior and lawful power, proceeds to make the solemn promulgation of the divine law. He is preceded by the incense, to show the sweet odour of the word of God, which renders the world virtuous and acceptable; lights follow to exhibit how it illumines the understanding, chasing the vapours of pas-

sion, and banishing the darkness of ignorance: the subdeacon assists in holding the book, to which the deacon exhibits his respects by perfuming it with incense. He greets the people with the usual salutation: after being answered he proclaims, *Sequentia sancti evangelii secundum Matthæum*, "The following of the Gospel according to Matthew," or whichever Evangelist it may be, marking the sign of the cross upon his forehead, his mouth and his breast, to show that he will profess the faith of his crucified Redeemer, by open exhibition, by words, and in his heart. He had previously marked the same sign upon the book, where the Gospel begins, to show the source whence that faith is derived. The people answer, whilst they also mark themselves, "Glory be to thee, O Lord." He then chaunts the selection for the day, in the solemn tone in which the ancient heralds of the East proclaimed the laws to the people. At the termination he points it out to the sub-deacon with the remark, "These are the words of Christ," or "the holy words." The sub-deacon immediately proceeds to point them out to the celebrant with the same observation; upon which the celebrant kisses the Gospel itself as a token of his affection, declaring at the same time, *Credo et Confiteor*, "I believe and acknowledge." In many places the Gospel is also given in like manner to such dignitaries as may be present. After the kissing of the book the deacon incenses the celebrant.

On several of the old copies of the sacred volume the cross was impressed, or embossed, or painted on the cover, or on the cloth in which the volume was folded; the clergy kissed the open book, and the laity kissed either the cover or the envelope, upon the figure of the cross, or whatsoever other device was substituted therefor. And from this practice came the usual mode of swearing; where the clergyman called upon God, who revealed the contents of the Gospel to witness, or adjured him to punish or reward, as he would violate or observe the oath which he made, by laying his hands upon the open book, whilst the layman did the same by kissing the book either closed or enveloped. And in several places the copy used for swearing, either has the figure of a cross marked on its cover, or is tied in such a way that the strings present that appearance.

During the chaunting of the Gospel, the people as well as the clergy stand. Formerly those who had staves laid them down as a token of their submission, and in the year 965, Miecislaus, the first Christian king of Poland, introduced a custom which was long followed by the Teutonic knights and several other religious military orders, as well as private knights, of either laying their hands on the hilts, or holding their swords drawn, in token of their devotion to the Gospel.

The celebrant at the altar stands with his hands joined, turned reverently towards the deacon who announces the sacred word; if the officiating clergyman be a bishop, he stands uncovered, and in most churches holding his crosier. From the beginning it was usual to hear the Gospel with this peculiar reverence. Nicephorus Callistus censured the custom, in the church of Alexandria, of the bishop remaining seated during the Gospel, which he said was a singular instance. However, Theophilus, as is related by Philostorgius, states that such also had been a custom in some churches of the East Indies several centuries since, but that it had been corrected. In order to guard against the irreverence of sitting during the Gospel, which began to introduce itself into some churches, Pope Anastasius directed that it should be corrected as an abuse.

Originally, the readers proclaimed the gospel as well as the epistle, through respect for the sacred writings, the prerogative of a deacon, if not of a priest, to chaunt it. In the church of Alexandria it was the duty of the archdeacon; such is also the case at Narbonne when the archbishop officiates. In some places a procession of several sub-deacons and deacons, besides acolyths, go before the deacon of the Gospel; and in Constantinople, on Easter day, the bishop himself was the chaunter; such is also the case in some other places, on peculiar occasions. The rites vary, but the object is everywhere the same, viz.: to exhibit the great veneration which should be paid to the sacred volume.

The custom of laying the book on the altar and taking it thence, though now retained for its mystic instruction, was originally introduced from the high respect in which the Gospels were held by the first Christians. These portions of the Scriptures were not made up in the same volume with the epistles, the psalms, and the collects, but were kept separate, and brought with great ceremony from the sacristy to be laid upon the altar, before the liturgy began. When the proper time for proclaiming the Gospel came, the deacon then went to bring them to the pulpit or ambo. The ancient custom was, that during the recital he turned towards the south, where the men were assembled, as it was considered more decorous for him to address them than the females, to whom it was expected their husbands, fathers, or brothers would communicate at home, in familiar conversation, what had been thus published, if they should happen not to hear it distinctly. This mode of turning towards the south has, during several centuries been changed; and now in most churches the deacon faces the north, in some few the west. We shall see the reasons of convenience and mysterious instruction, that produced and confirmed this alteration.

Towards the conclusion of the Mass of the catechumens, the attendants at the foot of the altar began their preparation for the Mass of the faithful, the commencement of which was the oblation. In order to have the part of the altar on the celebrant's right hand unincumbered, and thus to make full space for the offerings, the book was removed to the side upon his left hand. This was done after the epistle had been read, and whilst the choir chaunted the gradual. When the position of the altar was changed, so that the celebrant stood with his face to the east; the book thus removed for the Gospel was on the north side; and the sacristy, having its door of communication on the south or epistle side, made it also much more convenient for the attendants to prepare all that was necessary for the oblation. When the celebrant read the Gospel, he turned rather towards the side than towards the back of the altar, for the purpose of addressing what he read, in some measure, to those who attended near him, and being more easily heard. The deacon soon followed the example of his superior, in his mode of turning to read: and piety soon discovered a mystic reason for continuing the practice. The Gospel was the mighty power of the Lord, for the destruction of that great adversary of man, Lucifer, who so gloriously arose amidst the children of light, in the morning of his existence, (*Isaias* xiv. 12,) but who, falling to the earth, wounded the nations. In the pride of his heart, he sought to ascend into heaven and exalt his throne above the host of intelligences that, like the stars of God, decorated the firmament upon which the Eternal was elevated. He chose for his station "the sides of the north." To the north, then, against this adversary, the power of the Gospel was joyfully directed by the children of men; that he who sought to be like the Most High should be brought down into the pit. They who turned towards the west, chose this position as the most convenient to address the people.

In several churches there were many Greeks and Latins; and in most of those, the Gospel and epistle were chaunted in each language. In Rome particularly, in the early days of the church, this was the case, and the custom is still preserved when the Pope celebrates solemnly, on the great festivals of Christmas and Easter. This also exhibits to the faithful, the perfect union of those who observe both rites, in their common faith, government, and sacraments.

This concluded the Mass of the Catechumens. After which, there was usually a discourse by the bishop or some one appointed by him.

After this sermon the deacon warned the Catechumens and strangers to retire; previously however to the departure of the former, the bishop read some prayers for their improvement in virtue, and perse-

verance in the holy desire of being received into the church. He concluded with his blessing. The only rite that is now recollected as corresponding to this, is that which for centuries has existed in the Pope's chapel; where, after the sermon is concluded, the deacon bows before his Holiness and chaunts the confession, after which the Pope gives the usual form of general absolution, to which, by his authority, the preacher adds the publication of an indulgence, for those who have attended with true sorrow for their sins, and been reconciled to God, through Christ, by repentance. This rite was formerly not peculiar to Rome; the pontificals of other diocesses mention it; and it is generally believed to have been substituted for the blessing given to the Catechumens, when that order ceased to be numerous in the church.

In explaining the Mass of the Catechumens, it was necessary to dwell at some length upon a variety of topics, which, having been thus exhibited to the reader, shall be very slightly adverted to when they occur in the Mass of the faithful. Besides, although there be some diversity in the ceremonial of different churches even in this part of the liturgy, yet it is, especially in the canon, so comparatively small, that little, if anything, need be written upon it in a work like the present, which has no pretension to a literary or a critical character: and the chief part of this Mass is in substance so ancient, that little, save plain exposition, will be required.

The creed, though the first part, is the latest perhaps that has been introduced, and indeed can scarcely be called with justice a portion of the Mass, as that correctly speaking begins only with the oblation. Nor is this profession of faith always made.

In the early days of the church, as has been previously remarked, the creed was never committed to writing, neither were the forms of consecrating the sacraments; nor were the Catechumens initiated into the mysteries until the time of their baptism.

A symbol is a sign by which two or more persons upon comparison recognise each other, and by which also a person is distinguished from others. For Christians, the creed was the principal symbol. After the Catechumens and strangers had retired, the deacon in some churches warned those present, to examine each other, so as to be certain of the absence of intruders. This, however, was not the cause of having the creed recited at the Mass, though it might have been occasionally the test in this examination, even in the earliest days.

The first evidences that we find of its introduction are from the East. Timothy, Bishop of Constantinople, appears to have been the first, who in the year 510, gave any order for its repetition, in this part

of the liturgy. He did so, in order to show the detestation in which the faithful held the heresies then existing, especially that against the Holy Ghost. Some authors attribute its introduction to Peter of Antioch, in 471. Be that as it may, the custom soon spread from Constantinople to the neighbouring churches. The third Council of Toledo, in 589, ordered it to be said in the churches of the Spanish provinces: the French and Germans adopted the custom during the reign of Charlemagne. In the year 1014, the Emperor Henry induced Pope Benedict VIII. to direct it to be sung in the Mass at Rome. Berno, who was present, relates the answer made by the Roman clergy to the commissioners of the emperor, when they expressed their surprise, that Rome had not yet begun to sing the creed in the Mass. They said, "that it was quite unnecessary; because Rome had never been contaminated by heresy." Still there are writers who assert, that this only regarded the chaunting, not the mere recitation, for they say that Mark, the immediate successor of Sylvester, and the 34th Pope, who came to the chair in 336, had at that period directed its recital.

St. Thomas of Aquin gives the reason for the selection of the days on which it is now used, viz.: on the Sundays, and those festivals in honour of any facts or persons of whom mention is made in the venerable document itself, on the feasts of the Apostles who delivered its contents, and those of the doctors of the church who explained them.

The celebrant begins alone to show that the doctrine was delivered to the faithful by those heralds who were invested with the Saviour's commission: and the choir follows it up, to exhibit the alacrity with which the people make open profession of believing what they have thus learned; for as St. Paul says "with the heart we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (*Rom.* x. 10). At mentioning the name of Jesus, reverence is made by bowing the head; but at that passage which states his humiliation to become man for our sakes, we bend the knee; and on the two festivals of the Annunciation and Nativity of our blessed Redeemer, when we more especially commemorate this important event, the celebrant and his assistants kneel whilst the passage relating to it is sung by the choir. Whilst the latter part of the symbol is chaunted, the deacon, receiving the burse, from the master of ceremonies or the sacristan, pays due respect to the celebrant, and proceeds to spread upon the altar, the corporal or cloth which is to be under the offerings. When the creed is finished, the celebrant, before the offertory, salutes the people again with the address of *Dominus vobiscum*: to which of course he receives the usual answer. This might be looked upon as the proper commencement of the Mass of the faithful;

for, as the council of Valence stated in the year 374, the reading of the gospels and all that preceded the oblation, was to be considered only as a prelude for the Catechumens, and St. Ambrose mentions that it was after he had dismissed the Catechumens, he began Mass. (Ep. ad Marcellam Sorror.) We may also consider the whole office from this to the preface under the general name of the offertory. At present it consists in the offering the bread and wine by the celebrant, when they have been prepared for him; the incensing of the oblation, of the altar, and of the attendants; the washing of the fingers; the subsequent prayer; the invitation given to the people to pray; and the secret prayer.

Originally it was usual for the faithful to bring to the church the provisions, which they contributed to the support of the clergy, and the necessaries for the sacrifice and for the use of the temple: they offered them at this period, and the deacons selected what was proper for the altar; the remainder was sent to the bishop's residence, whence under his direction the clergy were supplied. This contribution was called an oblation or offering, and even sometimes a sacrifice made by the people. It is quite unnecessary here to enter into the history of the various customs and changes of different churches in respect to this offering. Some few vestiges of the practice remain; but the faithful are now generally accustomed, when they desire to have special commemoration made in the Mass for themselves or their friends, not to bring the contribution as it was originally made, to the church, and in kind, but to call previously upon the clergyman, and give him a very moderate offering in money.

The candles, however, given at ordinations, and the bread and wine at the consecration of a bishop, are remnants of this ancient practice. In some few places, offerings in money are made once or oftener in the year, at the altar, for the support of the clergy.

During the first four centuries this was done in silence, or at least without any continuation of the sacred office whilst the offering was made. But about the year 400, a custom began at Carthage, as St. Augustin informs us, founded upon the practice of the Jewish Church, and of which St. Augustin not only approved, but which he defended against the assaults of a tribune named Hilary. This was, that a hymn or psalm should be sung, during the offering: and this chaunt continued until the choir was admonished by the prelate that they might conclude, which admonition was given by inviting them to pray, *Orte.* St. Isidore in his book on church offices, (v. 1,) also assimilates this, to what is written respecting Simon, in *Ecclesiastes* 1. "When he went up to the holy altar, he honoured the vesture of holiness: and when he took the

portion out of the hands of the priests, he himself stood by the altar, and about him was the ring of his brethren: and as the cedar planted on Mount Libanus, and as the branches of palm-trees, stood round about him, and all the sons of Aaron in their glory: and the oblation of the Lord was in their hands, before all the congregation of Israel: and finishing his service on the altar, to honour the offering of the most high King, he stretched forth his hand to make a libation, and offered of the blood of the grape. He poured forth at the foot of the altar a divine odour to the most high Prince. Then the sons of Aaron shouted, they sounded with beaten trumpets and made a great noise, to be heard for a remembrance before God, (xxx.,) and the singers lifted up their voices, and in the great house the sound of melody was increased."

From Carthage the custom spread to other churches: some writers assert that psalms for this purpose were regulated in the Roman order by Pope Celestine as early as 430, whilst others would lead us back to the time of St. Eutychian, about 120 years before the transaction at Carthage, and assure us that even then this offertory was either read or sung. At all events, the greater portion of the selections now used, are found in the antiphonary of Gregory the Great, about the year 600.

Before reading this passage, now called the offertory, the celebrant invites the congregation by *Oremus*, to pray. Having read the appropriate selections, he is now ready to commence the oblation, whilst the choir continues the chaunt. If a bishop celebrates pontifically, he now goes to the altar, having taken off his gloves and washed his fingers, that he may the more conveniently perform his duty.

The sub-deacon has at this time, generally, a large silk scarf placed upon his shoulders, and going to the credence table, he takes the chalice, over which an attendant brings the end of the scarfs, and he thus carries the offerings up to the deacon who is at the right hand of the celebrant. The deacon receives the chalice, and taking off the paten or small plate with the bread, he delivers it to the celebrant, kissing as usual the object given, and the hand which receives it. The celebrant lifting the paten with both hands, presents to the Lord the bread that is to be consecrated; looking forward to what is about to be produced upon the altar under the appearance, he prays that it may be acceptable. Making the sign of the cross with it over the altar, he places the bread upon the corporal. Meantime the deacon has cleansed the chalice with the purifier, and poured wine into it for the purpose of consecration; one of the acolyths having brought up the cruets containing wine and water from the credence table: the sub-deacon holding the cruet with water requests the celebrant to bless it. In some places, if a bishop or prelate be present

within his own jurisdiction, it is carried to him for the purpose, as is also the incense. The water is blessed by the appropriate prayer and sign of the cross, and an extremely small quantity of it is mixed with the wine in the chalice; after which the celebrant, receiving it from the deacon, offers it in like manner as he has done the bread, and then laying the chalice on the corporal, he covers its mouth with the pall. The subdeacon receives the paten, which he holds enveloped in the scarf and retires to his place behind the celebrant.

The object of introducing the bread and wine is so well known as to require no explanation. The mixing a small quantity of water with the wine has been practised from the beginning, and there exists the most conclusive proofs of the Saviour having used the wine mingled when he instituted the sacrifice. The mystic lessons taught are from the most venerable antiquity: first, the offer of the eternal Father of the people, who because of the weakness of their nature are represented by water, together with Christ who is represented by wine, that, as the prayer expresses, since he vouchsafed to become by the incarnation, partaker of our nature, we might, in the resurrection, be made associates of his glory. The quantity of water is extremely small, and is altogether lost in the wine, to show how imperfect is that human nature which he assumed, and how completely we should subject ourselves to the divine will, so that we may live to God, with Christ nailed to the cross; and so live in the fulfilment of His precepts, that we could say with the Apostle, (*Gal.* ii. 20.) "I live, not now I, but Christ liveth in me." Another mystical lesson is that of the perfect union of the two distinct natures, divine and human, in the one person of Jesus Christ: we are also reminded by it of the water mingled with blood, that came forth from his side, when it was opened with a spear. Formerly the water was poured upon the wine in form of a cross.

In masses for the dead, the sign of the cross is not made over the water, for the same reason that no blessings is given at that sacrifice, because it is offered on behalf of those, who though still capable of profiting by our prayers, are not so subjected to the authority of the celebrant as to be blessed by him. The wine has no cross nor prayer over it, as it represents the divine nature, upon which no blessing can be conferred.

The prayers said at the offering of the host and chalice, are not of the most ancient, though yet of highly respectable standing: they only more distinctly and accurately express what was always substantially prayed for, in a low voice by the celebrant.

This mystic lesson is also taught by some liturgical writers. That during the celebration of the offertory, the people might beneficially

occupy their minds, with reflecting upon the manner of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem; whilst he was going as a lamb to the slaughter, the multitude met him with the loud acclaim of "Hosannah to the son of David," though they were in the course of a few days to cry out "Crucify him." Thus now we can contemplate the approach of that victim, whom we crucify by our sins. This will more fully apply to the termination of other prefaces.

The original usage was to consecrate the Eucharist upon the paten, which was very large; and was kept upon the altar not only to contain what served for the communion of the priest, but also for that of the people. However, about twelve hundred years have passed away since the custom has been introduced of consecrating upon the corporal, and then the paten was removed from the altar, and held enveloped in a scarf by one of the attendants, until it was required after the Lord's prayer, for the purpose of breaking the host upon it. Various customs prevailed regarding the person who was to keep it, and the manner in which it was to be held; for some centuries it was given to an acolyth, who not being in holy orders, was not permitted to touch the sacred vessels; but like the sons of Caath, (*Num.* iv. 15.,) held it enveloped; subsequently the duty was given to a sub-deacon, who, though in holy orders, yet continues to wear the scarf for the purpose of keeping this sacred vessel clean by having it rolled in this veil.

The prayer which the celebrant recites, bowing down, after having covered the chalice, has been extracted probably from the *Mozarabic Missal*, and is founded upon *Daniel* iii. 39, 40. Then raising himself to invoke the Lord, and looking to Heaven, whilst he invites the descent of the sanctifying Spirit, the Holy Ghost, he makes the sign of the cross over the oblation: for though the great work that is to be performed, derives its effect from the institution of Him who died upon the cross, yet the uniform testimony of antiquity assures us, that it is the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies and changes what is placed upon the holy table; and the Apostle St. Paul informs us, that it was by the Holy Ghost Christ offered himself unspotted to God, to cleanse us from dead works. (*Heb.* ix. 14.)

The incense is now put into the censer and blessed; the offerings, the altar, and those present are perfumed in due order; to exhibit to each proper respect, and to teach us how we should now send up our prayers before the throne of the Eternal. This mutual homage between the several members, is also not only a tribute of respect and an exhortation to prayer, but moreover, a token of communion.

The celebrant next washes his fingers at the corner of the epistle,

not merely to remove any impurity that might have been contracted from the censer, but as an admonition to him, how necessary it is to have the utmost purity of soul, for the solemn service in which he is to be engaged. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, writing about fifteen hundred years ago, for the instruction of his neophytes, or newly baptized, upon this subject, thus addresses them, (*Catech. Mystagog.* v.) "You have seen water brought by the deacon, with which the officiating priest, and the other priests who stood round the altar, washed their hands. Do you think that was done for the sake of bodily cleanliness? No indeed, for we are accustomed to enter the church purified; so that we have no filth, but are clean and pure; but this washing of the hands should exhibit to us, that we ought to be free from all sin; for as our deeds are represented by our hands, it has the signification, when we wash our hands, we cleanse our deeds." He then refers to the prayer from the psalms as given below: the same is taught by the author of the work on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, attributed to Denis the Areopagite. (Cap. 73.) The celebrant repeats during this ablution the following seven verses of the *Psalm* xxv. "I will wash my hands amongst the innocent: and will compass thine altar, O Lord: that I may hear the voice of thy praise, and tell of all thy wondrous works. I have loved, O Lord, the beauty of thy house: and the place where thy glory dwelleth. Take not away my soul, O God, with the wicked: nor my life with bloody men: in whose hands are iniquities: their right hand is filled with gifts. But as for me I have walked in mine innocence: redeem me and have mercy on me. My foot has stood in the direct way: in the churches I will bless thee, O Lord." To this he adds the Doxology of, Glory be to the Father, and so forth.

Going then to the middle of the altar, the celebrant bowing down, with hands joined in supplication, prays to the Holy Trinity to accept the sacrifice, which is about to be offered, that it may be to God the testimony of adoration, that it may redound to the honour of the saints, who are with Him in Heaven, and conduce to the salvation of those who are present, and of all the church. He also now beseeches the intercession of the saints; then kissing the altar, he turns round to request the congregation of his brethren to pray in like manner, that this sacrifice may prove acceptable to Heaven, and advantageous to those present: *Orate Fratres*, and so forth. They answer by the expression of their sincere desire, that it may be received by the Almighty, to the honour and praise of his own holy name, and not only to their benefit, but to that of all His holy church. The prayer which follows is called "the secret," because it is said in a low voice. The mystic writers tell us,

the object is to exhibit, that what is about to take place is to be performed by that divine power, which exceeds the understanding of man. The tenor of the prayer corresponds to that of the collect, and at its termination the words, *per omnia sæcula sæculorum*, are chaunted; to give the people notice that the prayer has been concluded, and to afford them an opportunity of answering, *Amen*.

The celebrant then commences the preface, or invitation to praise God, which precedes the canon or principal part of the liturgy. This invitation is chaunted. It is preceded by the usual salutation of *Dominus vobiscum*; but now, having the offerings which he is to consecrate before him, upon the altar, the priest does not turn round: after the choir answers, he invites the congregation, by *sursum corda*, to lift up their hearts; they answer *habemus ad Dominum*, "We have them to the Lord." He continues to lead them, *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*. "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God." He had previously lifted his hands, and now he bows his head; they answer, *Dignum et justum est*. "It is fit and just." He then continues to chaunt the preface, commencing with the declaration, that it is truly fit and just, becoming and useful, always, and in all places, to give thanks to God for his blessings, but especially on the occasion for which we are assembled; he then describes the nature of the festival, and the dispositions which are appropriate. Wherefore he calls upon them to render their praises through Jesus Christ our Lord, uniting their voices in humble strains with the angelic host, who sing. Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, the heavens and the earth are full of glory! Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is he, who comes in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest!

The celebrant ceases his chaunt, when he arrives at the *trisagion* or thrice holy, and the choir continues the thrilling strain, which the enraptured prophet and beloved evangelist heard in the heavenly court; a small bell, by its tinkling, gives notice, in some churches, to the assembly, that the most solemn canon is about to commence, so that they may redouble their attention. This, indeed, is the moment also to reflect upon the arrival of the great Victim of reconciliation in Jerusalem, when the multitude took branches of palm-trees, and went forth to meet him and cried, Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. (*John* xii.) The deacon, who stood behind the celebrant during the hymn, now goes up to remain at his side, and to assist him.

That portion of the liturgy which succeeds is called at present the "canon:" the meaning of this word is "a rule," and it is applicable to these prayers,—because, however the others might vary, this scarcely

differed in the several churches, and few changes have been made in it from the earliest epoch of our religion. Those made previous to the time of St. Gregory the Great, were comparatively trifling; and since his day, it has continued, during upwards of twelve hundred years, altogether unchanged. Pope Vigilius, about the year 540, called it the "canonical prayer." Innocent I., about 140 years earlier, gives it the same name that St. Augustin used when mentioning it about 250, viz., "the prayer" by excellence. In the capitulary of Charlemagne, in 789, it is denominated the "Missal." A council at York, in the pontificate of Celestine III., about 1195, styles it, "the secret of the Mass." And one at Oxford, in the pontificate of Honoriur III., about 1222, gives it the name of the "canon of the Mass;" several very ancient writers call it the prayer at or "during the action." References to the phraseology, as we now have it, are found in several very early authors, amongst whom are St. Ambrose, St. Optatus of Milevi, and others who wrote in the fourth century. A number of irrefragable critical internal evidences carry back the proof of composition to a much earlier period. Thus, the Council of Trent was fully within bounds, when it informed us that it was a compilation of the words of the Saviour, the traditions of the Apostles, and the institutions of some holy pontiffs.

The discipline in the first ages of the church regarding the secret, prevented its being reduced to writing; but a most remarkable similarity prevails in the liturgies of the several early rites, which evinces that they must have been derived from a common source.

The custom which still prevails of reciting the canon in a low voice, so as not to be heard by the people, thus giving to understand that the change which is effected in the bread and wine is the effect of the invisible and imperceptible operation of the Holy Ghost, has been derived from very ancient times. This reason has been given by several authors during succeeding centuries.

The priest lifts up his hands and eyes to heaven at the commencement, when he invokes the most clement Father to receive the gifts about to be offered; then bowing down he makes his supplication, and kisses the altar, previously to making thrice the sign of the cross over the offerings. He then entreats that these may be received for the whole church, especially for her visible head, the Pope—then for the bishop of the diocess, in some places, for the temporal rulers, and all adherents to the orthodox and apostolic faith. He then begs of the Almighty in a special manner to regard some living persons whom he particularly recommends; amongst them are his immediate benefactors: he concludes by the recommendation of all present, according to the

measure of their devotion, of which the Lord alone can judge; for he only can search the reins and the heart. Calling then to mind the saints, who, released from their bodies, are in celestial glory with the Lord, he brings before the divine view, that we not only communicate with them in the doctrine to which they adhered, but that we hold their names, their virtues, and their memorials or relics in veneration, and trust much to the aid which we expect from their prayers and merits, through Christ, their Lord and ours.

From the beginning it was usual to have in the church dyptics,—that is, parchments or tablets with two folds, so as to make three columns,—and the names of three classes of persons were inscribed upon these tablets. First, the Apostles and martyrs, of whom the church, under the conviction that no one could exhibit greater love than to lay down his life for his friend (*John* xv. 13), believed they died in that charity, which secured to them an immediate passage to the realms of bliss. These names were read in the assemblies of the faithful, when they congregated round the holy altar, not to pray for those named; for, as St. Augustin writes (in tract. 74, in Joannem), "Thus, at the table of the Lord we do not commemorate the martyrs, as we do others that rest in peace, so that we may pray for them,—but rather that they may pray for us, that we should follow in their footsteps." These saints were brought under the divine observation, upon the same principle as the Israelites so frequently brought their deceased patriarchs before the Lord, that he might be induced to act towards the Christian flock as he did towards Jerusalem when it was threatened by Sennecharib, (*IV. Kings* xix. 34). "And I will protect this city, and will save it for my own sake, and for David my servant's sake."

Upon another column were inscribed the names of those who had died in the peace or communion of the church, leaving indeed hope, but not assurance, of their being acceptable; but yet, as they might be liable to temporal punishment, though released from the guilt of sin, and freed from the danger of eternal pain, or by reason of lesser sins not fully repented of, being members of the church, they shared in her communion, and might be aided by her prayers; so that, through the merits of the Saviour, and the suffrages of their brethren, their afflictions might be diminished either as to its intensity, or duration, or perhaps both, in that state of purgation in which they were detained until their penalty was fully paid, or the divine mercy was extended. The doctrine of the people of Israel, and of all true believers from the beginning, on this point, was that which the Catholic Church has always held; and she has followed, in this respect, the discipline which

came from her founders, and which is similar to what the children of Abraham derived from their great progenitors.

The Jewish people continue, even at this day, the habit of observing peculiar solemnity of prayer for their brethren on the day of their decease, or that of their interment, on the third day, on the seventh, on the thirtieth, and on the anniversary. This people clearly did not borrow from Catholics (who, it is asserted, made this "fond invention" in the darkness of the middle ages) the religious customs which they thus observe. They trace back this belief and practice to the revelations made even before the Lord called their fathers from Egypt, to give them his new institutions upon Sinai. They find examples in Genesis i. 10, where the children of Jacob celebrated the exequies of seven days, not with the mere grief of the uninstructed, for they were not sorrowful even as others who had no hope (*I Thess.* iv. 12); so the observance of the thirty days was exhibited in *Numbers* xx. 30. This nation has always observed the anniversaries by prayer; and still, though its sacrifices have ceased, and it is no longer in their power to have them offered, as the valiant Judas procured (*II Maccab.* xii. 43), yet they preserve the practice as far as they are able; and therefore they have, on their yearly day of expiation, offerings and prayers for the dead. All the Christian liturgies had, from the beginning, prayers for those thus deceased; for, as St. John Chrysostom observes (Hom. 69, *ad pop. Atioch*), "It was not vainly regulated by the Apostles, that the tremendous mysteries, commemoration should be made of the dead." And St. Augustin informs us, in book 9 of his confessions, that his mother, when she found herself dying near Ostia, requested that she should be remembered at the holy altar; and in many passages of his works, this great doctor of the church informs us, as he does in Sermon 32, de verb apost., "The whole church observes this, which has come down from our fathers, that, for those who have died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, prayers should be offered when commemoration is made of them at their proper place during the sacrifice, and also that commemoration should be otherwise offered on their behalf." Thus, the saints were prayed to, the others were prayed for. The only difference that is found in this respect between the churches is, that upon some dyptics the same names are found upon different columns. This, however, is easily explained, as is also that of the names in different churches not being always the same.

The third column contained the names of the living. Amongst these, that of the Pope was first, then that of the immediate bishop,

some of the other prelates in the same province occasionally, frequently that of the emperor or king, and those of remarkable benefactors.

During the first eight or ten centuries, it was usual for the deacon to read those names at the proper time; and if any of the living had been excommunicated, his name was omitted: this was called striking him out of the dyptics. At this part of the canon which has been observed upon, and which is called the first memento, the list of the living was read first; that of the saints was read in the prayer afterwards. The first person who struck the name of the Pope from the list, according to Nicephorus, was Acacius of Constantinople, who expunged the name of Pope Felix II. Dioscorus, of Alexandria, who was the great promoter of the Eutychian heresy, struck the name of Leo the Great from the dyptics of his church, as did several oriental bishops who persecuted Athanasius, and embracing the Arian heresy left the communion of Pope Julius. These were predecessors of Felix, so that we must suppose Nicephorus in stating that it was first done by Acacius, intended to confine his meaning to Constantinople. The Pope's name was, however, subsequently restored in that church. The Emperor, Constantine Pogonatus wrote to the holy father at the time of the sixth general council, that he strenuously opposed an effort that was there made to erase the name of the Roman pontiff. It was, however, expunged when Photius made his great separation, in which, unfortunately, the larger portion of the Greeks joined their schismatical leaders.

The names of the saints retained at present in the canon, are only a few of the principal and most ancient, to which is added the general expression of all thy saints "by whose prayers and merits, we beg thee to grant, that in all things we may be strengthened by thine aid through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then spreading his hands over the oblation in like manner as it was usual to do in regard to the victim, (*Levit.* iv., viii), and looking forward to what is soon to be upon the altar, the celebrant prays that receiving the victim, with which, by this rite, he identifies himself and the congregation, on whose behalf he makes the offering, the Almighty would accept it for an atonement, that he would dispose our days in peace, save us from damnation, and place us amongst his elect. Venerable Bede informs us, in his history of England (lib. ii. c. i.), that it was Gregory the Great who added the works of these three last petitions.

It would perhaps, be well here to explain briefly for those who are not fully acquainted with it, our doctrine regarding the eucharistic sacrifice, otherwise it will be impossible for them to form a correct

notion of the ceremonial itself. One of our chief misfortunes in this and similar cases, is that the great body of our separated brethren form very strange ideas of our belief; they in most cases attribute to us what we either condemn as untrue, or reject as absurd. It is, indeed, difficult for many of them to procure accurate information; and it has been frequently found that they who were most in error, were those who imagined themselves best acquainted with out tenets. In the doctrinal explanations scattered through this little compilation, there is neither opportunity nor room for spreading out the evidence by which they are sustained. The reader must not, therefore, imagine them to be vindications, for they scarcely even deserve the name of brief and imperfect expositions of the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

Respecting the articles under consideration: In the first place, Catholics believe in the real presence by virtue of transubstantiation; and, secondly, they believe that the body and blood of Christ thus made present, are truly offered in sacrifice, on our behalf.

Upon the first point: they deny that the body of Christ is present in its natural mode of existence, though they believe it to be really, truly, and substantially present. To make this distinction clear, we shall have recourse to St. Paul, (*I Cor.* xv. 35, and the following verses.) Here the Apostle treats of the resurrection from death. It is a tenet of the Christian Church, learned from God by revelation, (for no reasoning could lead to the discovery,) that all men should rise in the same identical bodies which were theirs during their mortal pilgrimage; the bodies in which they shall arise will be truly, really, and substantially the same which they had before death. Yet shall they be changed in their mode of existence; "it is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body." (v. 44.) That is, though its identity will continue, its manner of subsisting shall be changed: its attributes and qualities will not be such as they were during its natural and mortal state, but shall resemble those of spirit. Consonant to this is the testimony of the Saviour himself. (*Matt.* xxii. 30; *Mark* xii. 25; *Luke* xx. 36.) "In the resurrection they shall be as the angels of God in Heaven." They shall be no longer subject to the laws, that regard bodies in their natural mode of existence, but shall be governed by those peculiar to the spiritualized state to which they shall have passed. To argue respecting bodies in this new state, as subject to the natural laws made for their previous circumstances, would resemble the absurdity of him who should undertake to bind an angel with a cord, or lock up a seraph in a dungeon.

Catholics know that Christ arose from the dead; they of course

believe that his body is no longer in its natural, but is now in this spiritualized mode of existence; they know of no absurdity more ridiculous, than to argue respecting this, as if it were subject to the laws which govern those bodies that are merely in their natural state. They observe facts recorded in the sacred volume, which prove beyond all question the folly of any effort to apply those principles to the glorified body of the Saviour. One of these is recorded in *John* xx. 19, where he entered the chamber in which the disciples were, though the passage to it was closed, and he must, therefore have carried his body, which was previously outside of the material which enclosed the room, through the same substance to the interior apartment where the brethren were assembled. A similar fact is related in verse 26, of the same chapter.

Catholics also believe, that though the Almighty has established general laws by which bodies produce upon our senses impressions which we call their appearances; and for wise purposes has ordained that similar bodies shall have similar appearances; and, generally speaking, that the same body shall have the same appearance, still these laws are not so uniform and constant, as not to admit of some exceptions. But supposing no ordinary exception; they believe that the Creator who made those laws, has power, when he thinks proper, by a special interference, to except one or more bodies from their operation; still they think it proper and reasonable to consider the laws in full force, until they shall have unquestionable evidence of the existence of an exception. However, if such evidence be adduced, they believe it would be then as unreasonable to assert that the excepted case was under the influence of the law, as it would be, previously to having this evidence, to deny the operation of the law itself. Thus they know that when we have the testimony of our senses for the appearance of a living man, it is proper upon the general principle to suppose that a man is present, and therefore Abraham reasonably concluded (*Gen.* xviii. 2), that he met human beings to whom he extended his hospitality. Lot and the men of Sodom reasonably believed (*Gen.* xix. 1, 5, 10), that they had human beings in their city, and *Josue* (v. 13) reasonably supposed that he saw and spoke with the man; yet in those, and many similar instances, the angelic substance, in exception to the general law, really had, by the exertion of supernatural power, the appearance of a human body; and Abraham, Lot, and Josue would have acted against every principle of reason, had they, when they received evidence that these cases were exceptions, still insisted that because the appearance was that of man, men and not angels were present. But had they the testi-

mony of God himself for the fact, that he placed the angelic substance under the human appearance, and notwithstanding this, had they obstinately insisted that such could not be the case, for that the substance must always correspond with the appearance; their unbelief and opposition would deserve to be called by a name more strong that mere folly or absurdity.

Catholics believe that Jesus Christ could, even before the resurrection, give to his body those qualities which it exhibited after he arose from the dead; and not only do they rest this belief upon his attribute of omnipotence, but they have it, sustained by the evidence of his transfiguration, related in *Matthew* xviii.: *Mark* ix.: *Luke* ix. 28. They also believe that by means of this body he could produce upon the senses of the beholder such impressions as he might judge proper; and that his simple word would be sufficient evidence to show an exception to the general operation of any law. They can, therefore, perceive no difficulty in believing, that he could give his spiritualized body the appearance of bread; but they do not consider it would be reasonable to believe that he did so, until they should have unquestionable evidence of the fact. His simple declaration would, however, be sufficient to establish its truth.

Substances are said to be fully changed, when one with its proper appearance, comes in place of another, so that neither substance nor appearance remains the same. Appearances are changed when the substance remaining unaltered, produces a different impression upon the senses of the observer, from what it previously did. Transubstantiation is when the substance is wholly changed, but the impression upon the senses of the observer are exactly the same as they had been, previously to the alteration. Thus we believe, that before the consecration, the bread and wine are really present under their proper appearances upon the altar: but that at the consecration, by the power of God, by the institution of Christ, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, by the ministry of the celebrant, the substances of the bread and wine are altogether changed, and the substances of the body and blood of Jesus Christ produced in their place, and these last excite upon the senses of the observer, exactly the same impressions which would have been produced by the former substances, had they still continued, and for the same length of time, and in the same manner. Transubstantiation is therefore, a change of substance without any change of appearance.

Though it would seem to be inconsistent with our principles of natural philosophy to assert that any body could, at one and the same

moment, be whole and entire at several points of space; yet it is believed that, even supposing the full truth of those principles, no difficulty can arise therefrom in the present instance: because, in the first place, they apply only to bodies in their natural state of existence; which is not the case of the body of Christ in the eucharist: because also, this body is now endowed with the qualities of spirit, of whose relation to space, if any, we are totally ignorant, save that we know One Spirit who is whole and entire at every imaginable point. He fills all space by his immensity, and yet he leaves room for all creatures; he is everywhere, and yet, though simple and immense, he is as it were multiplied by his entire perfection in every spot of the universe. We also know that created spirits manifest their correspondence to certain points of space, without being circumscribed as bodies are in this mortal state, so as not to be found without those points. And St. Augustin says of the human soul, that not only is it whole and entire throughout the body, but it is whole and entire through each and every part thereof. And in the third place, we have manifest scriptural evidence of the fact, that the Saviour after his resurrection was in at least two distinct places at the same moment. Our separated brethren have objected to us that it was impossible Christ should be present in the eucharist, because St. Peter declared (*Acts* iii. 21,) that he must remain in heaven "until the time of the restitution of all things." We freely assent to the correctness of the exposition so far as it declares that Jesus Christ in his resuscitated flesh remains in heaven, for ever sitting at the right hand of God. (*Heb.* x. 12) But we are also informed in the same book of the Acts of the Apostles (ch. ix.) that he appeared to St. Paul on this earth on the road between Jerusalem and Damascus, whilst he was also in heaven. (v. 17, ch. xxvi. 16.) The apostle shows that it was not a mere spiritual vision, for he founds upon this bodily exhibition, the argument of the truth and reality of the Saviour's resurrection. (*I Cor.* xv. 8.)

The only question now remaining regards the fact of Christ's declaration that his body would be really present in the eucharist. Upon this point the evidence that might be adduced is to the greatest extent, and it is of the most conclusive description. But this is not the place for its display. One or two observations however may be permitted. In the first place, it is admitted by all that he declared (*John* vi. 52,) "The bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world, and that (v. 53) the Jews therefore strove amongst themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them, Amen, amen, I say unto you, except you eat of the flesh of the

Son of man, and drink his blood you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." A number of his disciples who certainly could see no difficulty in his giving them bread to eat, and wine to drink, and calling these, emblems of his body and blood, would not believe that he could perform what he promised, and left him: others imagined that they were to eat his flesh in its natural state of existence, and their mistake was corrected, (63 and 64,) for the dead flesh of his mangled body was not what he was to give; but that body in its spiritualized state, united with his soul and divinity, such as he would bear at the time of his ascension to that heaven where he was before. It is also universally admitted, that on the night that he was betrayed, he, in fulfilment of his promise, sat down with his Apostles; (*Matt.* xxvi. 26,) "whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed, and broke and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye and eat: this is my body. And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them saying: Drink ye all of this: for this is my blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." The obvious meaning of these passages, and of several similar to them is, that under the appearance of bread and wine he gave his body and blood to his Apostles. It is also clear and unquestionable that he gave to them power to do what he had done. Of course the entire question will be resolved by ascertaining what he did. The only difficulty against admitting the Catholic doctrine, is found in its alleged impossibility. Taking the divine power into account, from what we have before seen, this difficulty vanishes: and all the evidence is in favour of the doctrine, for centainly the Saviour would not, on the most important and solemn occasion, use words calculated to mislead, when he foresaw that out of respect to his authority, the great mass of Christians would construe those expressions in their plain and obvious meaning. But if we could ascertain the fact, of what the first Christians believed to be the nature of the eucharist, all doubts respecting the meaning of his words would be at an end; because they who lived with the Apostles, must have learned from them exactly what they were taught by Christ. The following is suggested as a simple and easy mode of resolving this inquiry.

At the period of the unfortunate religious divisions which occurred in Europe in the sixteenth century, all the churches of Christendom professed the doctrine of transubstantiation. No person can seriously question this fact. This must then have been the doctrine of the first

Christians, or else it must have been substituted for a different and prior doctrine. Before asserting with any justice that such a substitution was made, it is requisite to show not only what the previous doctrine was, but also to exhibit when, and how the substitution occurred. An effort has been made to do so by exhibiting a decree of a council held in the Church of St. John of Lateran in the year 1215, by which it is pretended the doctrine of transubstantiation was established. In the first place, no decree or canon of that council bears upon the question. And not only did all the members of the Latin Church previously hold the doctrine, but it was also held by the Greeks; not only by those in communion with Rome, but by those who had been separated from her, and virulently opposed to her during upwards of four hundred years before that council was held. They did not receive it from the Latins, but as they asserted, it came to them from their fathers, who informed them also, that it was the doctrine of the Chrysostoms, the Basils, the Gregorys, and all their other great witnesses in the preceding ages, and that through them it had been derived from the Apostles. Thus is was clear that it was the general doctrine of the church in the ninth century, when this unfortunate Greek separation occurred.

Another effort was made to fix the period of its introduction in the eighth century, about the time of the second Council of Nice, when the Greeks and Latins being united, the error might have insinuated itself into both churches from a common, contaminated source. But at this epoch the millions of Eutychians who abounded in the East, had been separated from the parent church, and bitterly opposed thereto since the middle of the fifth century, and they always held the doctrine of transubstantiation, and declared that at the period of their condemnation at Chalcedon, in 451, it was the only one known amongst Christians as having come from the Apostles. Twenty years before this Council of Chalcedon, Nestorius and his adherents were condemned at Ephesus, and the antipathy and hatred which they bore to the Eutychians, was equalled only by the animosity of the latter against them: yet the Nestorians united with the Eutychians and the Greeks, in testifying that during the four ages that preceded their separation from the church, no other doctrine on this subject was heard of, but that in which all were united. Of course it is evident that it could not have been a novelty introduced in the eighth century, for it at least was the universal belief in the fifth age. The Macedonians, who were condemned fifty years before the Nestorian heresy, and the Arians, who were separated from the church about sixty years before the censure

of Macedonius in the Council of Constantinople, united in the same testimony. All these various sects indeed proclaimed that the church in communion with the Pope erred; but they each condemned the peculiar errors of the others; yet all united in declaring that our doctrine of transubstantiation was held by the first Christians, received by them from the Apostles, delivered to them by Christ, and contained in the Scriptures. We may extend the principle to a number of preceding separatists, who bore similar testimony, and thus arrive at the very days of the Apostles. But let us ask the reason of such unanimity respecting the doctrine of the eucharist, at this time, so soon after the death of the beloved Evangelist? It was clearly because no effort had been made to change what all had received from the Apostles, and what was uniformly believed in all the churches from Britain to the Ganges, from Scythia to Ethiopa. Had any such effort been made, we should have been informed thereof, and of its consequences, by the historians who have transmitted to us the particulars of so many petty disputes, of so many obscure sect-makers. We have the enumeration of heresies by St. Epiphanius, and he gives us no statement of any change of ancient doctrine upon this head. We have indeed the testimony of one ancient writer, who exhibits to us the phantasmatics as denying, consequently, the reality of Christ's presence. We are told that they did not admit either the eucharist or oblations, because they denied that the body of Christ could be there, for they asserted that he had no real body, but a phantasmatic appearance. Were there any other aberration, we should also have the testimony. But none is to be seen. Catholics are taught that their belief must be founded upon reasonable and solid grounds; and not having the evidence of any substitution of other tenets for the pure doctrine of the Saviour upon this point, they cannot reasonably believe that any change has taken place. We have a mighty mass of evidence, not only in the writings of the fathers who decorated the splendid ages of the church, but in the monuments of her early discipline, as well as in her liturgies, to show that the faith of the Christian world from the beginning has been what it is to-day.

Laying aside all these considerations, two others shall be just touched upon. The question is one of the fact, not of opinion. Fact is to be ascertained by testimony; the only testimony we can now have, regards what has been handed down in all the churches that exist, as the original doctrine of their founders. Let them be marshalled, and it will be seen that the churches which testify this original doctrine to have been that of transubstantiation, are at least four times as

numerous as their opponents. But let us apply another test. Let us exclude the Catholics, and assemble all those from the east and the west, who have departed from Catholic communion. Let all this multitude be brought to vote, either as individuals or as churches, and the vast majority of our opponents themselves will declare, that upon this point the original doctrine was transubstantiation. Surely then the separatist, however highly he may value his own opinion, will not venture to pronounce as unworthy of his respect, the testimony of more than one hundred and fifty millions of Catholics, and upwards of fifty millions of Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Copts, and so many others, who though separated from our church, yet believe that transubstantiation was the doctrine taught by Christ to the Apostles, the doctrine which of course is contained in the Holy Scriptures! But we must desist.

Upon the second point, Catholics knowing that the same victim who once offered himself in a bloody manner upon Calvary, is now produced upon the altar, and there in the hands of the priest offers himself to his Father on behalf of sinners, believe that it is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, and yet not a different one from that of the cross, for it is the same victim offered by the same great high priest. And the identity of the priest and of the victim constitutes the identity of the sacrifice. The difference consists of this, that on Calvary he was first immolated in blood, to take away the hand-writing of sin and death that stood against us: upon the altar, the immolated victim is produced under the sacramental appearance, and mystically slain by showing forth his death, in the apparent separation of his body from his blood; and the lamb thus placed as slain, is offered to beseech the application of his merits specially to those who make the oblation, or on whose behalf it is made.

The prayer which now follows is that which from the commencement has been used for producing the divine victim, and it is therefore called the prayer of consecration. The celebrant making several times the sign of the cross over the offerings, intreats the Almighty that not only would he receive the oblation that is about to be made, but also that he in his mercy would make it beneficial to us.

He knows that it will become the body and blood of Christ, but he begs that for us it may be made so; that is, that we may obtain the fruits of redemption by its means. This is besought through Christ himself.

The deacon now kneels at the right hand of the celebrant, torch-bearers frequently surround the holy place; the incense bearer is pre-

pared; the last notes of the angelic anthem of the sanctus have died upon the ear; all are in the attitude of homage and devotion, whilst the celebrant recites the history of the institution; and at the recital of the Saviour's words, in the Saviour's person, by his frail representative, He vouchsafes Himself to fulfil His promise; for though the heavens and earth should pass away, his word will not fail. He is then on the altar under the symbolic emblems! In some places a small bell tinkles to give notice; the celebrant adores, he lifts the host. He kneels, he rises, consecrates the chalice, he adores, he elevates, the bell continues, the people are prostrate in adoration. The ancient fathers are extatic in their descriptions of that awful and mysterious moment! In the Greek Church, the custom was to have the sanctuary enclosed with a curtain, which was drawn aside some time after the consecration, but previously to the communion, and the holy victim was exhibited for the adoration of the people. St. John Chrysostom tells the people in his fifth homily upon the epistle to the Ephesians, that they should look upon the sanctuary as if the heavens themselves were unfolded to their view, that they might behold Christ and the bands of angels that attend upon him. Angels indeed assist there, as he says (in Hom. 16, to the people of Antioch), for their King is present, whom they surround, as his guards accompany the emperor; and when we see the clouds of incense ascend, we should waft our aspirations upon the breathing perfume, that angels may present them to Him who was for us elevated upon a cross, that we might be exalted in His glory. Here indeed says Simon of Thessalonica (*de templ. et Miss*), as Paul foretold, in the name of Jesus every knee bends, and every tongue confesses that our Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God his Father. St. Ambrose (Lib. iii. c. 12, *de Spir. Sanct.*) describes what is produced as the flesh of Christ, which in his day the faithful adored in the mystery, and which the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus himself. And St. Augustin (in *Psalm* xcviii.) describes it as that flesh of which no one partakes previous to adoring it. This adoration continues during the canon.

The custom of elevating the host and chalice immediately after their consecration, was not introduced until after the heresy of Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, in France, who about the middle of the eleventh century began to raise doubts of the real presence: then the piety of the faithful introduced this custom as a testimony against his errors. The ancient usage was what is now called the second elevation, at the conclusion of the canon; and this agrees with the usages of the Armenians and Abyssinians, and in some measure with that of the Greeks. This custom of the elevation did not immediately extend to

every church. It originated in France, and in some places the host alone was lifted, in others both the host and chalice, and as the custom extended, the diversity also became manifest, until gradually, after a couple of centuries, greater uniformity was established.

The custom of ringing a small bell was introduced soon after that of the first elevation. The English church appears, if it did not originate the practice, to have been one of the first to adopt it, as some of the earliest regulations upon the subject, are found in her records. We have an epistle of Yvo, Bishop of Chartres, before 1114, in which he expresses his gratitude to Maud, Queen of England, for fine bells which she had given to the church of our Lady of Chartres, and by the ringing of which at the elevation, he says, her memory will be usefully preserved. This custom has not yet found its way into the Papal chapel, nor into others in Rome, though it has for centuries pervaded the western portion of the church.

The Apostle of St. Paul informs us (*I Cor.* xi. 26), that one of the principal objects of this divine institution was to show forth the death of the Lord until his second coming; thus whilst the priests of the new law did, according to the precept of the Lord, what he himself performed at the divine institution, that is, placed his body and blood under the appearance of bread and wine; they did so for a commemoration of him. His death was shown forth by the exhibition, as it were of blood drawn from the body. Whilst the victim, thus mystically slain by the sword of the word, which caused that separation, lies upon the altar, now that the salutations of the choir unite with the gratulations of the blessed spirits that surround the throne of this monarch of our affections, the officiating clergyman expands his hands; he will not, except for the purpose of again taking it, disjoin those fingers that have touched the holy sacrament, until he shall have washed them after the communion. The deacon assists at the book whilst contemplating the sacred symbols; the celebrant in his prayer calls to mind the passion, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour. If he makes the sign of the cross over the victim it is not to bless or to consecrate the source of blessing and the author of sanctity, but to exhibit his conviction, that He who died upon the cross, is present, and that every blessing which we can expect must be derived from His merits. He, therefore, by the five figures of the cross which he makes, being reminded of the five wounds inflicted upon the hands and feet, and the side of his Saviour, presents, in the name of the people, to the Eternal Father, this great Mediator of the New Testament, who entering into the holy heavens, behind that veil which during ages separated them from this earth, did, on that great day

when it was rent as he consummated his offering, in the midst of the aspirations of the hoary patriarchs, the venerable sages, the enraptured prophets, his afflicted mother, and astounded disciples, with the fragrance of his own merits, carry the smoking blood of expiation, into the midst of the adoring angels, to be poured as a rich libation before his Father's throne, so that being invested with an eternal priesthood, he might come forth to bless a world made penitent and redeemed.

In this prayer the figures of ancient days pass before his view. Through the long vista, the approving token of heaven is seen upon the sacrifice of the just Abel, who lies bathed in his blood, upon that of Melchisedec, the King of Salem and of justice, who stands with his singular offering by the side of Abraham, glorious in victory, more glorious for the fidelity which he exhibited upon that mountain, where he gave his son at the pile as a sacrifice. The celebrant beholds all these prophetic figures fulfilled in what lies before him. There, indeed, is the first born amongst many brethren, formerly slain for the iniquities of his people, by his own nation, but innocent and acceptable to heaven, his sacrifice is benignantly received. Like another Isaac, he bore to the mountain the wood upon which he was to be immolated; having manifested his obedience, he lives after the sacrifice, and is made the father of a mighty multitude, because he laid down his life for sin, he sees a long-lived seed, and the will of the Lord is prosperous in his hand. (*Isaias* iii). Though he makes but one offering of his body and blood, by which he for ever perfects those that are sanctified, (*Heb.* x. 14), yet he hath an everlasting priesthood, by which he continues the oblation under the appearances of bread and wine, thus being a high priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec. (*Heb.* viii. 24, and v. 10, 11). Ours is therefore a holy sacrifice,—ours is indeed an unspotted victim.

Bowing down in a posture of humility, the priest earnestly supplicates that Jesus Christ, whom he styles the holy angel, would present this offering on high, especially on behalf of those who are to approach the holy communion. After this, with his hands joined before his face, whilst he stands erect, he prays in spirit for those deceased members whom he desires to commemorate. The names are publicly read in many churches at this time from the dyptics, whence in several very ancient missals the prayer of *Memento* is styled *super dypticha.* About the fourteenth century, this custom reading the names began to get into disuse: however, in some churches the piety of the faithful continues the recital, and prayers are publicly requested for the deceased, as also for the sick, either after the gospel or after the communion. After

the private recital, or reflection upon the names, at this part of the Mass, a general petition is offered, upon the principle of that true Christian charity in which St. Augustin, in his book "on the care for the dead," gives so many instances. The following extract will, however, show the principle. "Supplications for the spirits of the deceased must not be omitted, the making of which the church undertakes for the departed in every Christian Catholic assembly: even without mentioning the names of all, she does it by a general commemoration, so that they who have left no parents, or children, or relations, or friends to do this kindness for them, should have it performed by this, their mother, when she supplicates for them together with the others.

To the dypties succeeded the mortuary, books kept in several monasteries and churches, from which the names of their benefactors were read on the anniversaries of their death.

Slightly elevating his voice, the celebrant, after praying for the dead, strikes his breast, saying *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, by which he also asks mercy for himself and other sinners. Venerable Bede, who wrote about the year 700, remarks upon this elevation of voice, which is made to exhibit that the prayer for the dead is concluded, and that the sacrifice also is about to be brought to its termination. The prayer entreats that he may be admitted to the fellowship of the saints, some of whose names are therefore mentioned, and the favour is asked through Christ our Lord.

If new fruits were to be blessed, they were formerly presented at this time; and at present the oil for the sacrament of extreme unction is blessed on Maundy Thursday at this part of the Mass. The prayer, therefore, refers occasionally to those blessings, but always to that better gift, the great legacy of his body and blood, bequeathed to us by the Saviour in that testament which he confirmed by his death. St. Thomas of Aquin explains the three crosses now made with the host over the chalice as emblematic not only of the three hours during which the Saviour was exposed upon the cross, but chiefly of the three great acts performed by him, immediately before the consummation of his sacrifice. First, his prayer for his enemies: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The second, his exclamation: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and the third, when he resigned himself to the last agony, with the expression: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." The celebrant then raises the host and chalice together, for the second elevation, but not as high as was formerly used, before the time of Berengarius. And the conclusion of this ceremony, with its appropriate prayer, terminates the canon.

After the termination of this most solemn service, the preparation for communion followed. Frequently there were in the church public penitents, who had been tried, and found worthy of reconciliation; this was then the time for performing that rite in their regard: but previously thereto, the celebrant (who at solemn Masses during the first ages was the bishop) turned to the altar, and expressing his unworthiness and apprehensions, but still encouraged by the precept of the Saviour, presumed to address God as "our father," and recited the Lord's prayer. The deacon now stood behind him, until his ministry was necessary at the altar; and therefore when the prayer is near its termination, he goes up to his right hand side to assist in preparing the holy eucharist for communion. The subdeacon goes up to the same side to deliver the paten which he had hitherto in charge, and having given it to the deacon, the scarf is withdrawn from his shoulders, and he retires to his place.

In the Greek Church the whole congregation united in the Lord's prayer; but in the Latin Church the celebrant chaunts it, so that the people may hear; and they unite in it by taking up the last petition. "But deliver us from evil." During the first centuries, when the discipline of the secret was in force, this prayer was never recited in the hearing of strangers or of Catechumens. Hence, on other occasions, when they were present, the celebrant only notified that it was to be said, by repeating the first two words, *Pater noster*, and it was said secretly, without coming to the knowledge of the uninitiated; but now, none except the faithful being supposed present, it is openly said or chaunted.

Several eminent writers remark that its petition, "forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us," is an excellent admonition to charity before communion.

In many places also, an old custom is retained by the deacon of holding up the paten to be seen by the people, after he receives it from the sub-deacon: the origin of this, was to notify to the congregation that the preparation for communion was about to commence. The celebrant now, animated with the sentiments of the prayer just recited, beseeches God to deliver those who assist, from past evils which are sins, from present evils which are temptations and disasters, and from future evils which are the eternal or temporal punishment for crimes. He also begs the intercession of the blessed Virgin and a few other saints to procure from God, peace in this life, and remission of sins for the other; through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ.

During this prayer he holds the paten in his right hand, and makes the sign of the cross with it upon his person; after which he kisses it,

because it is an instrument of peace, upon which He who is meek and peaceful, He who can give to us a peace that can never be procured from the world, a peace to which the criminal, the proud, and the ambitious are strangers, is about to be placed. The celebrant then puts the paten under the sacred host, and uncovering the chalice, he adores; after which rising, he breaks the host into three parts, whilst he concludes the prayer, in a loud voice, to afford the people an opportunity of giving their assent by the *Amen*. He then puts one particle of it into the chalice, saying, *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*; "may the peace of the Lord be always with you," to which the people answer; *Et cum spiritu tuo*. Covering the chalice previously to the repetition of his homage, he prays that this mixing and consecration of putting the two sacred things, the body and blood of Jesus Christ together, may be the means of bringing eternal life to those who are about to receive the communion.

St. Augustin informs us, in his Epist. 59 to Paulin, explaining some things in the Mass, that almost every church concludes the whole petition by the Lord's prayer. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Catech. Myst.* c. 5,) states that it was recited after the commemoration of the dead, and indeed it is clearly carried back to the days of the Apostles. The fourth Council of Toledo reprehends the conduct of some Spanish priests, who recited it only in the Mass on Sunday, omitting it on other days of the week, and orders the correction of this abuse.

Considerable variety is found in the customs and forms of prayer in various churches, respecting the preparation for communion. We shall confine our attention to those only which will tend to explain the present Roman rite. Gregory III., about the year 735, directed a peculiar form of confession to be recited after the Lord's prayer, and before the celebrant gave the blessing which, during several centuries, was bestowed at the termination of the canon. In the council of Saltzburg, in 1281, an order was made for reciting, about this part of the office, a number of psalms and prayers, to obtain from God peace for the church, at that time troubled and afflicted. John XXII., about forty years afterwards, followed up this order, by a direction given at Avignon on the xi. kal. of July, 1328, to have certain prayers, which he prescribed, said immediately after the Lord's prayer. Clement VI., between whom and John there only intervened Benedict XII., confirmed and renewed the direction of his predecessor. These prayers were omitted subsequently when peace was restored; but the Libera or form now said after the Lord's prayer, which contains an aspiration for peace, was continued. This form is much more ancient, though

the exact date of its introduction cannot be pointed out; because the prayers preparatory to communion, were left for a long time, in a great measure to the devotion of the celebrant. It certainly existed in the eighth century. It was customary also, at this part of the office, to publish the fasts, the festivals, and other notices. Then the bishop, by his blessing and a form of absolution which, though different in several churches, yet had a great similarity in all, admitted the public penitents to reconciliation. He also gave his blessing to the people, concluding it with the words, *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*; which salutation is still retained; though the blessing is now deferred to the termination of the liturgy.

The rite of breaking the host, is coeval with the divine institution of Mass, and hence the sacrifice itself was known amongst the first faithful, by the name of the breaking of bread. (*Luke* xxiv. 35; *Acts* ii. 46; *Acts* xx. 7; *I Cor.* x. 16.) From what has been previously stated, it is manifest that the body of Christ, which is impassible, is not hurt or broken by this division of the sacrament, and that He is whole and entire under the appearance of each particle, as St. Augustin says, (Lib. vi. *de Trinit.* e. 6,) of the human soul. "It is entire through the whole body, and it is entire in each part of that body." This right of breaking the host, has continued uninterruptedly in the church through every age, with this difference, that in some places and at some times, the number of particles were more numerous than at other places or epochs. At present amongst the Latins, it is broken into three parts, one of which is put into the chalice, as had always been practised. One of the other portions used, at some periods, to be kept for the communion of the sick; during several centuries however, it has been the custom, instead thereof, to consecrate a sufficient quantity to serve for the communion of the faithful, whether in health or sickness, and to keep what has been thus consecrated in a vessel called a pix or ciborium. The other portion served for the communion of the celebrant and of his attendants. Now, in general, the priest takes the whole for his own communion.

The mystic writers are copious in their reflections upon the ceremony of this breaking of the bread, as is their usual custom. In general, they inform us that it exhibits the death of the Saviour upon the cross, when bowing down his head, after he had declared that all was consummated, he gave up the ghost. As the apparent separation of the blood from the body exhibited the lamb as slain, so now would the union of the bread to the wine show to us his revivification after he had slept in death; and the sign of the cross made thrice over the mouth

of the chalice with the particle, whilst the peace was besought for the people, expressed the three days that he lay entombed, having procured for us peace and reconciliation by his death. The union of the body exhibits the mode in which Jesus Christ, reuniting his soul to that body which he made perfect, by the resumption of all that properly belonged thereto, now lives to die no more.

Another custom existed in Rome in the first ages, as is manifest from the constitution of Pope Melchiades, in 312, and of Pope Siricius, towards the close of the same century, viz: that the Pope sent one of the particles which he had consecrated on Sunday, to each of the titular priests of the churches of the city, as a token of communion; and the persons who received these particles, put them into their chalices at Mass, before the communion. Nor was this custom peculiar to the Pope and his cardinal priests; it existed in many other places, as we have ample evidence. It was even usual for bishops thus to interchange the token of their communion and affection. Nor was this merely a smybol of such communion, it was, moveover, an evidence of the unity of their priesthood, and of the unity of their sacrifice.

Pope Sergius I., who ascended to the chair in 687, directed, that during the breaking of the host, the choir and people should sing the *Agnus Dei.* "Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us!" This was sung thrice and a custom came in, that each time they who repeated it struck their breasts. The priests then repeated it in those Masses where there was no chaunt, and afterwards even with the singers, so that the practice became nearly universal.

In Masses for the dead, the petition to the Lamb of God, was to give rest to the deceased. About the year 1100, when the peace of the church was in some places disturbed, the last petition was changed from "have mercy on us" to "give us peace." But in the church of St. John of Lateran, the ancient mode is still preserved, of saying thrice, "have mercy on us."

The celebrant now, bowing down before the altar, recites a prayer, beseeching from the Lord Jesus Christ that peace which conduces so much to the charity of this life, the sanctification of souls, and the salvation of the elect. This prayer regards also the unity of the church, and the mutual affection of its members. It was not generally introduced before the tenth century. Whilst the celebrant recites it, the deacon kneels at his right side, and at the conclusion, rises and kisses the altar, whilst the celebrant kisses it at the same time, to receive that peace which he is about to give to others, and then embraces the deacon, saying, "Peace be to you," to which the answer is, "and with thy spirit."

After which, paying his homage to the Holy Sacrament, the deacon descends and gives the salutation of peace to the sub-deacon, and if the custom so be, he gives it to the rest of the clergy, or to the first of each order, if many be present, and so it is communicated from these first persons to their brethren. Meantime the deacon and the sub-deacon go to the altar, where the celebrant has begun to recite two prayers before the communion.

In the Masses for the dead, this prayer and the salutation of peace are omitted, because at those Masses the attention is occupied with suffrages for the deceased. Besides, these were not considered public Masses, and it was only at such, this ceremony was performed.

This salutation was, in all nations, and at all times, considered a token of affection. But in the Christian religion men were made brethren in Jesus, and in the days of their early fervour, the converts were most anxious to let all men know by their mutual charity, that they were his disciples (*John* xiii. 35); though the believers were a multitude, they had but one heart and one soul. (Acts iv. 32.) The custom in their assemblies, was to have not only one eucharistic banquet, but also many other symbols of their unity and several bonds of attachment. They had their agapae, a remnant of which may still be seen in many of our churches, where the custom prevails of distributing blessed bread through the congregation, even during the time of the sacrifice; they also saluted by an holy kiss. (*Rom.* xvi. 16; *I Cor.* xvi. 20; *II Cor.* xiii. 12; *I Thess.* v. 26; *I Pet.* v. 14.) In the Christian assemblies, as has been previously remarked, there was a separation of the sexes; and from the earliest times, not only the clergy but the laity gave this token of spiritual attachment. We have in the works of some of the most ancient and esteemed fathers, many allusions to the custom, and edifying exhortations to charity, founded upon the observance. About the twelfth century, in some churches, this separation of the males and females began to be neglected. The ancient salute was then discontinued, as inconvenienct and unbecoming. And in England we find some of the earliest descriptions of a new mode, which was consequently introduced, of kissing a picture of the crucifixion or some other little instrument, which was sent about. Thus in the synodical constitutions of Walter Gray, Archbishop of York, in 1250 or 1252, we find amongst the furniture of the church, an *Osculatorium*. The same is found in the statutes of Canterbury, 1281. In a council of Oxford, in 1287, it is called *asser ad pacem*. And at the council of Merton, about 1300, the name was *tabular pacis*. Gradually this new fashion pervaded France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, and still subsists in some churches: though

in general, the giving of the peace has altogether fallen into disuse amongst the laity, and in several places amongst the clergy, with the exception of those immediately engaged about the altar.

The lesson taught by it, is as obvious as it is important. However, the necessities of society and our own convenience, may demand the distinctions of rank during our mortal career, and good order, the public peace, and general welfare require their preservation and protection, we should be all deeply impressed with our equality of origin, not only from a common parentage, but from the same material of clay, and by the hand of the same Creator. All temporal discrimination will therefore cease in that common dust to which we must so speedily return; we are, besides, called by a common Redeemer in the hope of one salvation, through the same merits and the same institution, to a common heavenly abode. We should then each bear with the failings of our brother, as we expect to have our own tolerated or overlooked, and we should try to exhibit ourselves animated with that charity for each other, which was manifested for us all, by Him, who, for our sakes, when we were His enemies, gave Himself as the ransom for our iniquities.

The two succeeding prayers have, within the last eight hundred years, been generally selected from many that the private devotion of the clergy formerly used as a preparation for communion; and to create uniformity, custom now having the force of law, has restricted the celebrant to those only. The moment for communion has at length arrived, and taking the sacred body in his hand, the priest says, "I will receive this heavenly bread, and I will call upon the name of the Lord!" But then recollecting his own unworthiness, he thrice strikes his breast, adding, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; say but the word, and my soul shall be healed." Then making the sign of the cross with the Sacrament, he says, "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to eternal life. Amen:" after which he receives the Sacred Host. Then meditating for a moment, he prepares to take the chalice. The deacon uncovers it, and the celebrant carefully gathers from the corporal any particles which may be upon it, and conveys them to the chalice, saying, "What shall I give to the Lord for all that he hath given to me? I will take the chalice of salvation, and I will call upon the name of the Lord. Praising, will I call upon the name of the Lord, and I shall be saved from my enemies." (*Psalm* cxv.) Then making the sign of the cross with the chalice, he says: "May the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to eternal

life. Amen!" And holding the paten under the chalice and his chin, he reverentially receives the contents of the sacred vessel.

The expressions of the prayers are calculated to excite the most perfect devotion; the acknowledgement of unworthiness, blended with the expression of humble confidence, is taken from the gospel of *St. Matthew*, (viii. 8,) and with very little change in the expression of the centurion. We have reason to believe that it was, at a very early period, used upon this occasion, in the assemblies of the faithful. St. John Chrysostom, in his homily upon St. Thomas, the Apostle, exhorting the faithful to go with proper dispositions to communion, has the following passage: "Let us say to the Redeemer, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof; yet as thou willest be received by us, relying upon thy indulgence we approach to thee." And in the early part of the third century, Origen in his Homily 5, upon some topics of the Gospel, thus expresses himself: "When thou takest that holy food, that uncorrupted banquet, when thou enjoyest the bread and cup of life, thou eatest and drinkest the body and blood of the Lord, then the Lord enterest under thy roof; and do thou, therefore, humbling thyself, imitate the centurion, and say: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof."

If communion is to be given, which, however, is not usual at high Masses, the general form of confession is said, and the celebrant prays for the pardon of the penitents, in the accustomed manner; then kneeling to adore the Holy Sacrament, which is now uncovered upon the altar, he rises, holds the vessel that contains it in his left hand, and taking a particle of the sacrament between the forefinger and the thumb of the right, he exhibits it to the people, saying: "Behold the Lamb of God; behold him who takes away the sins of the world; Lord, I am not worthy, and so forth." Then going to where the communicants are ranged, he puts the Holy Sacrament upon the tongue of each of them; the communicant holding a cloth under his chin, for the purpose of keeping upon it any particle of the sacrament that might fall at the administration. During this giving of the communion, the celebrant is sometimes assisted by the deacon, who holds the paten also under the sacrament for the like purpose. We are not certain whether, in the first days of Christianity, during its administration, the faithful were silent. It is probable they were. However, the custom of singing a psalm or hymn, during the whole period that intervened between giving the kiss of peace and the thanksgiving by the celebrant, after his own and the people's communion, is so general amongst the Greeks, the Armenians, the Abyssinians, and the Latins, and the evidences extend so

far back, that it must be considered at least one of the earliest usages of the church. This psalm has since got the name of "the communion." After the participation and distribution of the sacrament, the officiating clergyman has wine poured into the chalice, which being used to purify it, he subsequently drinks, and also some wine and water which are poured upon those fingers with which he had touched the sacred host. After this, his attendants cleanse the chalice, wiping it with the purifier.

The principal difficulty which our separated brethren make respecting this part of the office, is the "withholding the cup from the laity," as they call, giving communion only the appearance of bread. They are under the impression that this is, on our part, a palpable violation of the divine command, and a gross infraction of the Saviour's institution. Perhaps they who read this exposition will not object to consider a few suggestions, which may lead them to suspect that their impression is erroneous.

There are several facts upon the subject, in regard to which we are agreed. During the first eleven centuries, it was almost the common practice of the church to give communion under both appearances. Next: it is still the general practice of the Greeks and other orientals, not only the sects separated from our church, but also of the portions in our communion who, however, lawfully follow a peculiar discipline. Again: decrees have been made by the Popes in the fifth century, directing that they who refused to receive under the appearance of wine, should be altogether denied communion; and we also admit, that by the divine institution, the person who consecrates the eucharist, that is, who celebrates Mass, is bound to receive under both kinds, as well as to consecrate them. Upon all these points we make the most full concession; but neither of these touches the question upon which we differ, viz.: whether it be contrary to the divine institution, and the nature of the sacrament, to give communion in one kind only. Let us now consider some other facts.

Nothing is more clear from church history, than that in private communion the most usual mode, at all times, was to receive only under the appearance of bread; sometimes, indeed, under the appearance of wine only; and it was always considered that such communions were good and sufficient, and by no means contrary to the divine institution. It generally occurred when hermits took the holy eucharist with them to the places of their retirement; when travellers took it with them to sea, or on long journeys into infidel countries; when, during the time of persecution, the faithful were permitted to take it home, that they

might have the opportunity of communion, if they should be deprived of their clergy, or if they should themselves be in danger. To these and other similar instances, we might add the abstemious, who could not bear the taste or smell of wine, and who were frequently known and admitted amongst the communicants: all these received only under the appearance of bread. The sick generally received under this form only. Children received communion only under the form of wine. Yet in every age of the church, these were also considered to have fully partaken of the body and blood of Christ; for his is now a living body, from which the blood is inseparable. "Christ rising again from the dead, dieth now no more." (*Rom.* vi. 9,) though by the words of consecration, the Lamb is upon the altar "as it were slain;" (*Apoc.* v. 6,) the body appears as if separated from the blood; still, when the body is made present, the blood accompanies it of necessity; and when the blood is made present, the body necessarily accompanies it also: so that under either kind, Christ whole and entire, a true sacrament, is received.

Nor did the Saviour give any precept for those who communicated, to receive under both kinds. The expression so frequently quoted to make it appear that he did, viz.: "Drink ye all of this," (*Matthew* xxvi. 27,) was only addressed to those to whom he gave the power of consecrating, because they alone were then with him; and St. Mark informs us that "they all drank of it," (xiv. 23,) so that the extension of the term used by the one evangelist is precisely defined by the other. It is indeed true that the Saviour did say, (*John* vi. 64,) "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." But surely the Saviour did not contradict himself: and he also said, (*John* vi. 52,) "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." If he says, (v. 55,) "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life;" he also informs us, (v. 52,) "The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." And though he assures us, (v. 57,) "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him," yet he promises also, (v. 59,) "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever." The entire difficulty is removed, and the passages made consistent, and not contradictory, by the consideration, that under either appearance there is really flesh and blood. Hence St. Augustine, (lib. iii. *de consens*, evangel. c. 25,) informs us that the Saviour himself gave communion under one kind only, to the disciples at Emmaus, (*Luke* xxiv. 30, 35,) where it is distinctly stated that he vanished after giving them the bread.

The *Acts* (c. ii. 42) and St. Paul (*I Cor.* xi. 27) state, that "whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this chalice of the Lord unworthily,

shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." It is true an effort has been made within the last three centuries to change this and many other texts; but, from the beginning, the true reading has been given as it is here. The whole text, however, might be easily spared. There are several other topics of consideration, of which one or two shall be submitted.

The Manicheans believed that wine was created by the evil principle, and that it was criminal to use it for any purpose; several of them came to Rome at the commencement of the fifth age, and concealed themselves amongst the Catholics at communion. These persons never touched wine; it is therefore manifest, that unless it had been a matter of frequent occurrence for Catholics to receive the Holy Sacrament under the appearance of bread only, this concealment would have been impossible, for the novelty of declining the chalice could not escape detection. When this discovery was made, then, for the first time, Pope Leo the Great, about the year 450, ordered that the faithful should all receive under both kinds, so that the Manicheans might be detected; and Pope Gelasius, at the close of that century, directed for the same purpose, that no one who refused the chalice should be admitted to communion. The law continued in force until its object was attained, and became obsolete.

The eastern churches pour the consecrated wine upon the particles which had been consecrated, and give the communion with a long spoon. But so far are they from believing that a divine precept, or the nature of the sacrament, requires communion under both kinds, that they continually give the eucharist, under the appearance of bread alone, to great numbers who cannot go to the churches; such as shepherds, agriculturists, and others who reside at a distance, females whose family duties or other circumstances do not permit their leaving home, and so forth. And in the Greek church, Mass is said, during Lent, only on Saturdays and Sundays; communion in both kinds is given only at Mass; and on the other days very many of the clergy and laity receive the Holy Sacrament, which had been previously consecrated for that purpose, under the appearance of bread alone. Many other topics might easily be cited, amongst which are the canons and acts of several of the Protestant churches which direct communion to be given in one kind only in several cases.

From all these reasons the conclusion is manifest, that the mode of giving communion has always been considered, in the universal church, a matter of discipline, left by Christ to the regulation of the legislative tribunal, provided always that it secured that his body and blood should

be given; that this discipline has been and is various; and that in the Latin Church, for very sufficient reasons, it has been long established, that to those who do not actually celebrate, whether they be clergy or laity, communion is given only under the appearance of bread. Would to God there were no other difference between us and our brothren respecting the nature of this most venerable sacrament!

The Council of Trent made no rule upon this discipline, leaving it altogether to be regulated by the wisdom and prudence of the Holy See. Pius IV. was prevailed upon by the entreaties of the Emperor Ferdinand, in 1564, to use the authority with which he was invested, and by the advice of the cardinals, permitted the bishops of Germany to use their own discretion as to administering under one or both kinds. But a very short experience proved that the inconveniences preponderated so greatly over the very questionable benefits that were expected to result, that with very general approbation Pius V. revoked the permission within two years after it had been conceded. Mr. Eustace, who appears to have had much more taste than erudition, was probably not aware of this, or of many similar facts, when he thoughtlessly penned his paragraphs respecting the Church of St. Peter, in chapter v. volume ii. page 178, of his classical tour; in which, amongst some just remarks, he introduces others of an entirely different description. The Greeks who are separated from the Catholic Church have, during centuries, been indefatigable in discovering every topic upon which they could charge the Latins with any aberration in doctrine or discipline; they even objected to their departure from the apostolic example, by shaving their beards. Yet, upon the subject of communion in one kind, they could find no ground for cavil, though they follow a different discipline themselves.

The confession of Pope Gregory III. mentioned above, was probably only a substitution for some previous form, as that now in use, and which is said before communion, has been adopted instead of the one compiled by this pontiff.

After the Latin Church had discontinued the discipline of giving public communion in both kinds, a custom was adopted in several places, of dipping the sacrament in unconsecrated wine; and though, for a time, occasionally tolerated, it was condemned and abrogated by many local councils, and has long since altogether disappeared in the West. One of the reasons generally alleged for the abrogation was, lest it might have the semblance of deceit, by leading the people to suppose that it was a substitute for the sacramental wine; or lest it might lead them to imagine that Christ was not present, whole and entire, body,

blood, soul, and divinity, under the appearance of the bread alone. The true reason, however, for the original practice was founded in the fact, that the particles consecrated for communion being much thicker than they are at present, rendered this usage convenient for the more easily swallowing the sacrament; but a more appropriate remedy was found in reducing the bread to its present tenuity. Previously to altogether discontinuing the administration in both kinds, another custom existed in some churches nearly similar to that which at present prevails in the East, of dipping the particles for communion into the contents of the chalice after its consecration, and thus distributing them. It was extensively adopted in England, and strenuously defended by Ornulf, Bishop of Rochester: it was, however, prohibited by canon xv. of a council held in 1175, under Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury.

In several of the eastern churches that have not reduced the bulk of the particles, when communion is given only under the appearance of bread, the old custom is followed, of dipping the particle in unconsecrated wine, which is the more usual, or in water as in the well known case of old Serapion, mentioned by Eusebius the historian, (lib. vi. cap. 34.)

The celebrant, after the purification of the chalice, reads the passage of the Sacred Scripture sung at the communion, which is also called by that name. That and the post-communion, or thanksgiving for benefits received, are read and chaunted at the epistle side, to which place the book has been removed, as there is now no impediment there, and it is the more convenient situation. He salutes the people before the post-communion, to give them notice of the thanksgiving, and after it to take his leave. The deacon then, turning to the congregation, sings the *Ite missa est*, to tell them that, the office being terminated, they are at liberty to depart. But, as in penitential times, other offices followed: *Benedicamus Domino*, "Let us praise the Lord," is substituted therefor; the answer to each is *Deo gratias*, "Thanks be to God." In Masses for the dead he sings *Requiescant in pace*, "May they rest in peace;" which is answered by "Amen." But on the two last occasions he turns to the altar, and not to the people—as in the first case the office was to continue, and in the other the obsequies were to follow.

The officiating clergyman bowing down before the altar, prays that God would vouchsafe to make the sacrifice that has been offered, useful to him and those on whose behalf it was presented; and then turning to the congregation, and making the sign of the cross over them, he prays that the Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost would vouchsafe to bless them. This blessing has been added at the request of the

people, who also, through devotion for the gospel of St. John, requested that its commencement should be read after the blessing, which is therefore done at the gospel side, unless some other lesson is required by the occurrence of two solemnities upon the same day.

Frequently, if a prelate be present within his own jurisdiction, and be not the celebrant, he gives this last blessing. And when he celebrates, and is attended by an assistant priest in a cope, this latter does much of what would otherwise be performed by the deacon. His form of blessing differs from that of a priest. He commences by the versicle *Sit nomen Domini benedictum.* "May the name of the Lord be blessed." Answer, *Ex hoc nunc et usque in sæculum*: "From henceforth and for ever." Vrs. *Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini,* "Our help is in the name of the Lord." *Qui fecit cælum et terram,* "Who made the heavens and the earth:" then he makes the sign of the cross thrice, once at the name of each person of the Holy Trinity, and towards the several directions in which the people surround the altar; whilst he entreats that they may be blessed by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

If other bishops are present they bow, but all others kneel.

HOLY WEEK AT ROME

IN THE CHAPELS OF THE VATICAN, AND THOSE OF EASTER SUNDAY, IN THE CHURCH OF ST. PETER AT ROME

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

Irish College, Rome, Mar. 26, 1833.

To Henry Englefield, Esq.

My Dear Sir:—Three weeks have elapsed since the first part of this compilation was finished. These few sheets, though seemingly upon a different subject, are in fact but an extension of the former: so that without a perfect acquaintance with the explanations given in what preceded, the present will be, in many places, altogether unintelligible.

In giving publicity to the former explanation, I felt it my duty to express, though feebly, to the exalted and venerable personage, at whose bidding and under whose patronage I undertook this task, the sentiments which I entertained towards him. On the present occasion, I cannot consent to omit mentioning what is due to you. Independently of the zeal that you have otherwise manifested in contributing to make this city and the rites of our church interesting to those who are estranged from our faith; I am indebted to you for the greater portion that I have learned of peculiar customs, and special practices which had never come under my observation; and which I could not have sufficiently understood from mere description, without other aid. I have on this head also to make my acknowledgements to the respectable vice-rector of the English College, by whose kind information I was led to consult you. Monsignor Brocard, one of the masters of ceremony of the papal chapel, to whom you introduced me, has been good enough to prevent some mistakes which I should have otherwise made, and showed his readiness to give me every information; and Father Giannotti, who has charge of the sacristy as assistant to Monsignor Augustoni, upon our presenting the letter of Cardinal Weld, not only gave us a full opportunity of examining all the vestments and vessels, but expressed his anxiety to give such further aid as was in his power.

I have, as far as the time would allow, consulted the works of Benedict XIV., Cardinal Bona, Martine, Le Brun, Azevedo, Zaccharia,

Georgi, and Cancellieri, as well as the Missals and other liturgical books, and have given no explanation, and made no assertion that I have not found sustained by more than one of these.

To the zealous and laborious co-operation of our amiable and talented friend Rev. Dr. Cullen, Rector of the Irish College, I owe more than I can express. He not only furnished me with the materials, and corrected some mistakes, but, what was most important, superintended the press, which is indeed a laborious task, when the compositors do not know the language in which they set up the type.

As an American prelate, I feel particularly gratified in the hope that this effort of one of their adopted brethren will prove as acceptable to those of my fellow-citizens who visit the holy city, as you believe it is likely to be to the large and respectable portion of British subjects, that from time to time sojourn within its precincts. This feeling is considerably enhanced by the reflection, that in the venerable successor of St. Peter, who at present so usefully presides over the church, and who, of course, has the principal share in those sacred duties which I have endeavoured to describe, I behold the former active, zealous, and enlightened prefect of the Propaganda; whose deep interest and laborious exertions in the concerns of the church of the United States, have been so beneficial. Through his hands were the proceedings of our provincial council submitted to his predecessor of cherished memory; through his ministry as prefect did our hierarchy receive the approbation of its labours from that see to which, because of its better presidency, it is necessary that every other church should have recourse; and to himself, when called from that station by the venerable and eminent Senate of the Christian world, to occupy the vacant chair, have we dedicated the publication of our first legislative acts. If the obligations by which an humble individual is bound, could with propriety be mentioned as additional motives, kind protection more than once extended, and the conferring of favours equally unexpected as unsought, might well be added. But these minor considerations should be all merged, in viewing the calm dignity and apostolic firmness with which his holiness has met the intrigues and efforts of that combination of infidels, which has in Europe profaned the name of liberty, and, under the pretext of extending its blessings, sought to inflict a deep wound upon religion, by stripping the Holy See of its temporal independence; thus renewing those scenes of affliction which blur the pages of former history. Yes, they show us times when religion wept over the ruin and scandals which ambition, and faction, and tyranny produced in this city. It was under such circumstances that the Pontiffs were first driven from their basilics

to celebrate the sacred mysteries in private chapels: and it was then by reason of their poverty, caused by contentions and plunder, those basilics themselves frequently were so dilapidated as to be unfit for the celebration of the rites with becoming dignity, that by a sort of prescriptive usage, this custom, of leaving the large church for the private chapel, became fully established. The example of the presiding Pontiff, on the occasion of these ceremonials, is indeed edifying. Even strangers to our faith have expressed their admiration. No one can see his figure at the divine offices without being deeply impressed by his silence, his recollection, and the air of devotion that breathes around him. He truly shows by his manner, the life and energy of that faith which lives within. In him, indeed, the performance of the ceremony is but the genuine expression of a devoted soul; and whilst he thereby converses in spirit with his God, he leads others to similar conversation. He feels, like the patriarch upon the mountain, that the place is awful, because God is there.

That God may long preserve the venerable father of our church to edify his children by his example, whilst he guards the sacred deposit by his firmness and prudence, is a prayer in which I am convinced I shall be joined fervently by you.

I have the honour to remain,

My dear sir, with sincere regard,

Your most obedient, humble serv't,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CEREMONIES OF WEEK DAYS

From the earliest period of Christianity, the observance of Lent preceded the festival of Easter, and the last week of this holy time has been one of peculiar solemnity, not only because of the special preparation that was to be made for the Easter communion, but also because of the important facts which are then commemorated; hence its ceremonial is one specially interesting.

The object of our church ceremony is not mere idle show; such exhibitions would, in religion, be worse than a waste of time, and might even become mischievous, for persons might be thereby led to imagine that the mere observance of the outward forms, was the service of that God who seeks true adorers to worship him in spirit and in truth; and who can, therefore, never be pleased by any homage which is not internal and spiritual: or the observance might degenerate into superstition;

an expectation being cherished of deriving from mere external actions, effects neither belonging to their nature nor promised by God.

As an impression frequently exists in the minds of some well-disposed persons, that the multitude of ceremonies during this week is little consonant to the spirit of religion, and really is superstition; it may not be amiss to premise a few general observations before entering upon the special explanation of the several parts.

The legitimate objects of external rites in religion, as far as they are of human institution, are the instruction of the mind and the amelioration of the heart; in other words, the promotion of enlightened piety. Whatever does not tend to this is at least useless; probably mischievous. The Catholic Church is desirous of having all her observances tested by this principle; but, unfortunately, several who admit its correctness will frequently take no pains to ascertain how the facts they observe are brought under its influence; and they pass judgment without sufficient examination.

The mind is enlightened not only by conveying new information to the understanding; but also by recalling to the memory what was passing into oblivion, and by deeply imprinting upon it those traces that were becoming indistinct or faint. The heart is ameliorated when its affections are excited to the condemnation of vice, to sorrow for sin, to gratitude for mercies, to desire of God's glory, to resolutions of fidelity in His service, love of His law, benevolence towards our fellow-creatures, and exertions for their benefit; especially if the great motive which impels to these be the love of our Redeemer.

The lessons calculated to produce so much benefit, might be conveyed not only by the voice of the preacher, but by the exhibition of the printed page: words whether spoken or written, are merely conventional signs for the purpose of exciting ideas, and the ear or the eye might be equally well impressed by other means, as by the sermon or the book. Music can affect the soul through the one, as painting can through the other. How often has he to whom the most eloquent orator addressed himself in vain, been vanquished by the charms of melodious sound? How often has the painter or the sculptor riveted the attention of him who has read description after description with complete indifference? To how many generations has Laocoon proclaimed his anguish? Can you count the multitudes that have hung round the Transfiguration? Who will describe the sensations produced by the Miserere? He who would endeavour by an abstract semblance of philosophy, to argue against what is thus testified by nature through the voices of myriads, may well be expected soon to bid you hold fire in your hand,

and think of Caucasus. Yet have men written polished sentences, they have constructed rounded periods, and called them by the name of religious philosophy, and philosophical religion, and rational devotion, merely to deprive religion herself of those natural aids which, under the auspices of heaven, and frequently by the express command of God himself, were used for the promotion of his service amongst his people. Either of these taken separately is useful and powerful, but when the combination of all is applied to bring the mind to any particular frame, the effect is almost irresistible. When music, scenery, action, and poetry unite to call up the remembrance of ancient worthies, of cities buried under the ruins of ages, of transactions nearly obliterated by the hand of time, transactions in which the observers now have no actual interest; how is the imagination seized upon, the memory excited, the affections interested and the very heart itself engaged? Yet this is only ceremony.

And shall we be told that it is superstitious to use the most natural and efficacious mode of so exhibiting to a redeemed race, the tragic occurrences of the very catastrophe by which that redemption was effected as to produce deep impressions for their religious improvement? This is the great object of the church in the ceremonial of the Holy Week. This is the great end she seeks to attain by the observances which she has established. And, therefore, she must upon the plainest maxims be acquitted of the charge of superstition; her judgment or her taste, or both may be arraigned if you please, but her religion is vindicated. If the multiplication of religious rites be superstition, then is the God of Sinai its most powerful abettor.

Without entering farther into the details of the Lenten observance, it will suffice to remark, that on the fifth Sunday in Lent, which is exactly a fortnight before Easter, the commemoration of the passion or sufferings of the Saviour commences. On the eve of that day the ornaments are generally removed from the churches or covered; and the crosses veiled with deep violet in token of mourning and. penance, so that during this fortnight, the appearance of the churches indicates to the faithful the sentiments which befit the solemnity. Formerly the Catechumens who had been found worthy, were baptized on the eve of Easter; and the public penitents who had been in fasting, in prayer, and in other religious exercises, seeking reconciliation through Christ, expected also to be admitted to the sacraments. Now that the great week was about to commence, not only did the body of the faithful take a deeper interest in the facts which were brought to their view, but also these particular classes had their special duties. The first day of this

week, therefore, was called by a variety of names, by reason of the several observances. The approved Catechumens were selected and declared "competent," hence it was called *Dominica competentium.* They had abstained during Lent from the use of the bath, but now preparing for the unction which followed baptism, they washed their heads, on which account it obtained the name of *Capita lavantium.* As the council of Agde directed that the symbol should be then explained to the "competents," the Gothic missal styles the Mass of this day *Missa in symboli traditione.* The Popes also, in commemoration of Magdalen's piety towards Jesus, (*John* xii. 3,) were accustomed on the previous day to give larger alms than usual, that they might show towards the poor, who are the members of Christ, that charity which she exhibited to their head. The day received also a title from this custom. But the names of the Sunday of palms, the Sunday of olives, the Sunday of flowers, and so forth, were the more general appellation. Macri, as quoted by Jacob Goar, gives a curious and interesting account of the customs of the Maronites on this day, respecting the olive tree which they bless and carry in procession. Gretser also describes the ceremonial at Jerusalem. The transaction which is commemorated is related by *St. Matthew,* (chap. xxi.)

This occurred at the close of our Saviour's public ministry, when, having made every preparation for the accomplishment of all that had been written concerning him by the prophets, he went up to Jerusalem for the consummation of his sacrifice.

We must, previously to considering the ceremony performed at the Papal Chapel, become acquainted with the stations, offices, and duties of the attendants.

The Pope is not only a bishop, but is visible head of the church, and is, therefore, attended by a more numerous and dignified body of clergy than waits upon any other prelate. He is also a temporal sovereign, and has, of course, the proper officers of state attached to his court. They also are to be found in his chapel. This is not a public church in which he officiates as the celebrant; it is his private place of worship, where the offices are performed by his clergy, but in which the proper respect is always paid to his Holiness, both as the pontiff and the sovereign; and he occasionally performs some few of the ecclesiastical functions.

His throne is placed at the Gospel side of the altar having on each hand a small stool for his two attendants. On Palm Sunday, he wears a large cope of a bright purple colour, approaching to red; over the clasp which fastens it on his breast, is a silver plate, called a formal,

a considerable portion of which is finely gilt; on this, in beautiful relief, is the figure of the venerable ancient of days, (*Daniel* vii. 9,) clouds are embossed wreathing about the figures of attending cherubim, (*Exod.* xxv. 18,) and circles of precious stones surround the whole: one larger and more beautiful than the rest occupies the centre. (*Exod.* xxviii. 29.) On his head is a plain mitre of silver cloth. This is his ordinary church vesture, at present, on days of penance and mourning.

Down to the time of Pius VI., from that of Clement VIII., about the year 1600, the Popes had a splendid formal of pure gold, with a rich olive branch of fine enameled green of the same metal, surrounding three large knobs of valuable oriental pearls. But this was not the only property of which the church was plundered during the pontificate of that heroic and venerable successor of St. Peter.

The Cardinals are the high senate of the church, and the privy council of the sovereign. They are selected by his holiness from amongst those ecclesiastics most distinguished for their learning, piety, and other estimable qualifications. In ordinary dress, in essential authority, and in general rank, all the members of the sacred college are upon a perfect equality. Though not always known by the same appellation, nor always enjoying the same privileges, their body is one of the most ancient in the church, and they are the representatives of its hierarchy.

Six of them are cardinal-bishops; they are ordinaries of what are called the suburban churches, or those within the immediate district of the city of Rome.

The Dean of the sacred college, who is the senior, is bishop of Ostia and Valetri; the next is bishop of Porto, St. Rufina and Civita Vecchia, and sub-dean of the sacred college; the other four take rank according to the date of their attaining a suburban diocess; these are the sees of Sabina, Frascati, Albano, and Palestrina. They sit on a bench which extends from the right of the platform on which the throne is erected, towards the front entrance to the chapel, the senior being nearer the throne. Next to them the senior cardinal-priest is seated upon the same bench, and his brethren who represent the priests, sit successively in the order of their appointment to the sacred college. It is required that each should be in the holy order that he represents; but it generally happens, that several of the cardinal-priests are in fact bishops; and some of the cardinal-deacons are also in the order of bishop or priest; but it is also in the power of the pontiff to dispense, for good reason, from time to time, with the execution of the law, which makes it obligatory upon a cardinal to receive the holy order befitting his rank, within twelve months from the date of his appointment, under pain of

rendering his nomination void. It sometimes has happened that such a dispensation was granted, especially to enable a man well qualified for the situation, though not in holy orders, to hold the office of secretary of state.

The two senior cardinal-deacons assist on the right and left of the papal throne; the others, according to their seniority, occupy the bench opposite that of the bishops and priests, the senior being the nearer to the throne. But when the Pope solemnly officiates, the three junior cardinals of the order of priests sit at the side of the deacons on that part of the bench which is more remote from the throne, yet so as that the junior cardinal-priest is nearest to the junior cardinal-deacon. When there is a full attendance of the sacred college, the number of priests on that side will frequently be more; and if only one deacon should attend beside those who assist the Pope, he will sit at the same side with the bishops and priests.

The whole number of the sacred college is seventy, viz.: six bishops, fifty priests, and fourteen deacons. This number, however, is seldom full. At present the bishops are five, the priests thirty-seven, the deacons ten, making in all fifty-two, and leaving eighteen vacancies. Of the present college, Pius VII. created twenty, Leo XII. eighteen, Pius VIII. three, and the present Pope, Gregory XVI. eleven. The Pope has also reserved three *in petto*; that is, he has declared to the consistory or assembly of the sacred college, that he has made the appointments, but he has, for sufficient reasons, not as yet published the names of those promoted. When he shall have done so, they will take rank from the period of his declaration and reservation of the names, and not from that of their publication; so that they will outrank all of the same order, that shall have been created in the interval. But if the Pope should die without publishing their names to the consistory, the nomination is without effect. The present number of cardinals in the city is thirty-two. Upon the vacancy of the Holy See, the sacred college have the government of the church, and are invested with authority to administer the states; they are the electors of the new Pope, whom they select from amongst their own body. The cardinal-priests are the titulars or rectors of the principal parish churches or stations in Rome; and the cardinal-deacons have also their titles from some of the ancient churches of the city; it is also the privilege of the first cardinal-deacon, to announce to the people the election of the Pope, and to crown him. The first cardinal-priest has, except when the Pope solemnly celebrates, a seat on the platform of the throne, in front of one of the assistant cardinal-deacons, and it his duty to offer the incense, and so forth; on the

more solemn occasions this duty devolves upon the first cardinal-bishop.

Each cardinal has chaplains, one of whom always attends his eminence in the chapel, or at public functions. On ordinary occasions this chaplain wears a purple sutan and cincture, and sometimes a cloak; he sits on the step before his eminence, whose beretta or square cap he holds; he also either displays, gathers up, or carries the cardinal's train, as may be necessary, and on those occasions when his eminence wears the mitre, his chaplain wears a surplice and a scarf like a stole, with which he sustains this ornament, when not actually worn by the cardinal.

The usual dress of the cardinals in the chapel is a red sutan or cassock, with a cincture of the same colour, having tassels of gold, red stockings, a rochet over which they usually wear a *cappa* or ample cloak, with a large tippet of white ermine, which hangs over the shoulders and chest: they take off the ermine in summer: on their heads they wear small red skull-caps, and sometimes square red caps. In times of penance and mourning they change the red robes to violet colour, and on two or three particular days, to rose colour. On solemn occasions, when the Pope officiates, or when there is a grand procession, they all wear red shoes, and mitres of white damask silk, the cardinal-bishops wear copes, the cardinal-priests, chasubles, and the cardinal-deacons, dalmatics of the colour proper for the solemnity, but on days of penance, the deacons wear chasubles. Under those vestments they have the cassock, cincture, rochet, and amict. During the vacancy of the see, when giving their votes, they wear large purple mantles called croceia, and on some less solemn occasions, they wear over the rochet a manteletta or short cloak, through which they put their arms; and over this a mozzetta or tippet, with a small hood, on which occasions the cardinal-bishops exhibit over this last the chain of the pectoral cross, but the cross itself is not seen. This may be considered their dress of state, when not engaged in sacred functions: but when in full jurisdiction, that is, in the churches of their titles, or during the vacancy of the Holy See, the manteletta is always laid aside. Cardinals promoted from any of the religious orders, preserve in their robes the peculiarity of colour belonging to that association, and never use silk.

Next in rank to the cardinals, and in the order in which they are here printed, are the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. Their court dress is the same as that of a cardinal in sutan, cincture, rochet, manteletta, mozzetta and cross, except that the colour is purple. Next to them rank, according to the date of their being inscribed as assistants, the arch-bishops assistant at the throne, and then in like gradation the bishops assistant at the throne.

In the papal chapel they all sit on the bench to the left of the throne, and over their sutans and rochets all these wear a purple serge cappa gathered up and the fold brought under the left arm, with a tippet of white ermine: the patriarchs wear exactly a similar dress, and when the Pope solemnly officiates, they all wear amicts over their rochets, and copes of the proper colour, with mitres of plain linen. The first of the assistants hold the book, and the second the lighted candle, for the holy father when he reads or sings. When the solemn service is performed by the Pope at his throne, these assistants sit or stand on the steps at each side.

Amongst these are generally two of the domestic prelates of his holiness, viz.: his almoner, who is generally an archbishop *in partibus infidelium*, that is, of some see in which there are few, if any Christians, and which being under the dominion of the infidels, renders it perfectly easy to have him permitted to reside in Rome, the law requiring the residence of a bishop at his see, being in this instance dispensed with; the other is the sacristan of his holiness, who is since the time of Pope Nicholas IV., about 1290, an Augustinian friar, generally bishop of Porphyry *in partibus*. His duty is to keep all the ornaments and church furniture, and to see everything properly prepared: a priest of his order is the assistant. The sacristan wears a black cappa with black fur. And here it is remarked once for all, that when a member of one of the religious orders is promoted to a prelacy, though he conforms to the general fashion of the dress appropriate to the rank to which he is promoted, he keeps the colour of the religious community from which he was taken. The sacristan gives the holy water to the Pope, except when it is administered by a cardinal, or vicar of the cardinal-archpriest in his own basilic; he administers the last sacraments to the holy father in his illness, celebrates Mass, and says the prayers for the cardinals in conclave; and is rector of the parish of the Papal family. The patriarchs of Venice, of the Indies, of Lisbon, of Antioch of the Greek Melchites, of Antioch of the Maronites, of Antioch of the Syrians, of Babylon of the Chaldaic rite, and of Cilicia of the Armenian, can also have places in this rank; they have precedence according to seniority of appointment.

It would be natural for a stranger to imagine that this place of assistant-bishop was merely an ecclesiastical rank. Such, however, is not the fact; for those bishops have no additional jurisdiction therefrom, nor does this distinction give them any precedence outside the papal chapel. Besides, from the nature of one of their privileges, viz.: that they have such nobility as if they were sons of counts, *una nobilla comme*

se da genitori conti tratto avessero la lore origine, it would appear that like cardinals, they were attached to this chapel, not merely in their ecclesiastical character, but also as a sort of minor nobility in the court of the sovereign. The first four patriarchs, however, have in virtue of their patriarchal rank, an honorary precedence above all other bishops and cardinals.

The next prelates, whatever their ecclesiastical order may be, take rank only from their civil offices.

The governor of Rome wears the ordinary dress of an assistant-bishop; his seat is opposite the throne in the papal chapel, to the right of all those who sit on the back bench, but the prelate who celebrates Mass and his attendants, are of course farther in towards the altar; and near the door in the extreme angle, one of the noble guard stands as sentinel with a drawn sword, at the entrance of the sanctuary.

The prince-assistant at the throne stands upon the platform near the first cardinal-deacon, in his court dress. This privilege belongs at present to their excellencies, Aspreno prince Colonna, Domenico prince Orsini, and the Paluzzo prince Altieri, who is senator of Rome. They take the place by alternation or arrangement. The senator's court dress is red, with a yellow cloak, the ordinary court dress in black.

Next to the governor, and similarly habited, is the auditor of the apostolic chamber. His charge is principally that of the administration of justice in law and equity.

Similarly habited is the treasurer of the chamber, who sits next to the auditor: his office is not only that to which all accounts are rendered, and by whose order all payments are made, but he is also a judge of extensive jurisdiction, and president of the apostolic exchequer.

On his left is the prefect of the apostolic palace, who is major-domo of his holiness, and has considerable judicial and administrative power, not only in the pontifical family, but also over other persons and things.

When the bishops dress in their sacred vesture, these prelates occupy a different seat; they at such times sit on the second bench, or that of the prothonotaries-apostolic.

The next is a rank merely ecclesiastical; it consists of the archbishops and bishops who claim no civil rank, nor special privilege; they are called non-assistants. In the papal chapel they sit on the back bench opposite the throne next to the civil prelates above described. The eastern archbishops take the right. The Armenian prelate wears his beard, and over a purple sutan he has, on ordinary occasions, a purple cope, lined with green, trimmed with red and white: on solemn occasions his vesture is an alb, over which is an exceedingly rich cope,

and other appropriate ornaments; his mitre is embroidered with gold. The dress of the Greek prelates for ordinary chapels differs very little from that of the Armenians, but on solemn occasions their rich vesture has a nearer resemblance to the ancient dalmatic of a deacon, but that the sleeves are longer, and they wear wristbands corresponding to the vestments, and crowns instead of mitres. To their left, is the place for the Latin bishops, who wear similar dresses to those of the assistant-bishops, and take places according to their date of consecration, except that archbishops always have the precedence.

There is an intermediate bench in the Sistine chapel, behind that of the cardinal-deacons, which extends from the pulpit towards the door; upon this bench the prothonotaries-apostolic are seated, in the prelatic dress. In the chapel they rank next to the bishops. They carry back the institution of their college to St. Clement, the companion of the Apostles and fourth Pope, who governed the church from the year 91 to 100. This pontiff appointed seven notaries, one for each region of the city, to collect and register the acts of the martyrs; this notarial college was recognized by St. Antherus, the nineteenth Pope, in the year 253, and again by St. Julius, the thirty-fifth Pope, about the year 540. The duties of this office of record were extended, and the president of the body was looked upon as one of the most important officers of the Holy See, and in the seventh and eighth centuries he, as one of the commissioners of the see during vacancy, subscribed documents together with the first cardinal-priest, and first cardinal-deacon, then called arch-priest and archdeacon of the Roman Church. Venerable Bede gives an instance of it in 640, immediately after the election of John IV. (*Hist. Eccles. gen. Anglor.* I. ii. c. 19.) Pope Martin I. about the year 650, mentions as a known regulation, that during the absence of the Pope, the administration of the see was in the archdeacon, and priest, and *primicerius*, which was the title of the chief notary. Pope Sixtus V., about the year 1590, made some regulations for this college of prelates; amongst others he fixed the ordinary number or *partecipanti* at twelve, besides a number of supernumeraries, and assigned their places in the chapel. Benedict XIV., about eighty years since, made other regulations for this college: amongst the privileges of the *partecipanti*, is that of conferring the degree of doctor, the appointment of notaries, and so forth. The dean, as their president is now styled, by reason of their original occupation of collecting the acts of the martyrs, has a place in the proceedings for the canonization of saints, and the members are the officers employed for drawing letters apostolic regarding patriarchal, metropolitical, and cathedral churches.

The Pope's chamberlain, *maestro di camera*, who is generally of one of the most illustrious Italian families, if he be not in the order of bishops, is entitled to a place upon this bench.

The Pope's auditor is always a lawyer of the highest standing, as he has to advise his holiness respecting appeals, and a variety of legal difficulties which are brought up. He generally hears those applications standing by a chair on which the Pope is supposed to be present, as the King of England is supposed to preside in his court of king's bench; his place is also on this prelatic bench.

The Archimandrite of Messina ranks next, if he has no higher place by another title; then the *commendatore*, or president of the great hospital of Santo Spirito.

The abbots-general of the several monastic orders, nine in number, who are entitled to wear mitres, have their seat to the left of the non-assistant bishops: viz., Benedictines of Mount Cassino, Basilians, canons Regular of St. John of Lateran, monks of Camaldoli, Vallumbrosians, Cistercians, Olivetans, Sylvestrinians, and Jeromites. Next to them on the left, are the generals and vicars-general of the mendicant orders: viz., Dominicans, minor observantins, minor conventuals, Augustinians, Carmelites, Servites, Minims of St. Francis of Paula, Redemptioners, Capuchins, Trinitarians, and bare footed Carmelites.

The conservators of Rome, who represent its civic council, and the prior of the Caporioni or magistrates of its wards or divisions, stand on the steps of the throne, on the right hand side, below the assistant-prince.

The master of the sacred hospital or dwelling, *maestro del sagro ospizio*, formerly held the authority of the major-domo and chamberlain, but his place is now merely honorary. It was hereditary in the noble family of Conti. It is now vacant: he wears a court dress, and stays near the entrance of the choir as guardian of the chapel.

The auditors of the Rota sit on the steps of the throne, and on those of the altar. They succeed to the ecclesiastical functions of the apostolic sub-deacons, suppressed for their irregularities by Alexander VII., on the 25th October, 1656. Those sub-deacons were established to the number of seven, by Pope Fabian, about the year 240, and were subsequently increased to twenty-one, which was their number in 1057. They became afterwards more numerous, and held considerable authority. But the auditors of Rota, which is a judicial tribunal, however ancient their origin, do not appear to have been brought into much notice before the time of Pope John XXIII. who in apostolic letters dated at Bologna viii. kalends Junii, 1450, styles the auditors of causes of the sacred

palace, which was their title, *apostolic chaplains.* Sixtus IV., about seventy years afterwards, reduced their number to twelve, of whom one was to be a Frenchman, one a German, two Spaniards, one a Tuscan, three Romans, and the other four, one from each legation of the Papal territory. This court has cognizance of a large share of ecclesiastical, as well as of civil causes, and its decisions are always accompanied by a statement of the grounds on which they are made, and are highly respected. On ordinary occasions, they wear the prelatic dress; but on solemn occasions they wear a surplice over the rochet. The dean of this college holds the Pope's mitre when his holiness performs solemn functions; the college furnishes the officiating sub-deacon on such occasions; two others bear his train; one of them accompanies the nobleman who pours water on the hands of his holiness, one of them incenses the cardinal-deacon, and then incenses the non-assistant bishops, one of them also gives the peace occasionally, and one carries the cross. Several of them also have seats in various congregations.

The master of the sacred palace is a Dominican friar, his dress is that of his order, white, with a black overcloak. Pope Honorius III., who governed the church from 1216 to 1227, gave the office to that order. This officer is the Pope's theologian, and ranks amongst the auditors of the Rota, after whom he sits. He has the inspection of the discourses for the papal chapel, also the power of licensing publications, none of which can appear in Rome without his permission. He enjoys many other privileges.

The clerks of the chamber sit near the auditors of the Rota, their number is twelve; several of them preside over various tribunals, such as regard provisions, currency, roads, streets, waters. And the whole body forms a court of appeal from the decisions not only of these tribunals, but also from the decisions of the treasurer's court. The appeals are heard by the direction either of their own president, or that of a court of revision, called voters of the signature. Two of these prelates accompany the lay-gentlemen, who pour water on the hands of the Pope after the offertory, when he officiates solemnly. One of them has charge of a cloth laid upon the vestments, and at Christmas, one of them bears the swords which the Pope blesses. When the Pope dies, they accompany the Cardinal Camerlengo, clothed in black, wearing rochets, for the purpose of recognising the body; they then receive from the pro-datary and the secretaries, the seals which they bring in presence of the congregation of cardinals, and there break.

The voters of the signature had their number fixed at twelve, by Alexander VII., and were formed into a college to replace the apostolic

acolyths dissolved and suppressed by that Pontiff, at the same time that he suppressed the apostolic sub-deacons. This body is one of judicial revision, which has the power of sending to the court of appeals cases from those tribunals, the correctness of whose decision is suspected. Formerly they were chosen from a body called the apostolic *referendaries.* As supplying the place of the acolyths in the ecclesiastical functions, they furnish persons to carry the incense, the lights, and the cruets; one of them also has charge of the Pontiff's gloves and ring. Their dress and place are similar to those of clerks of the chamber.

The regent of the chancery who examines, compares, and authenticates bulls, and administers the oaths of ecclesiastical dignitaries: the abbreviators of the Park, who have also places in the chancery; and the auditor of contradictions, have their places amongst the prelates.

The masters of ceremony wear purple cassocks, and surplices, and see the proper order preserved: on festivals their cassocks are red.

The whole pontifical family, ecclesiastical and lay, have places in this chapel, viz.: the private chamberlains, who are clergymen to wait in the antichambers, and regulate the entry of those who seek audience. They wear a purple cassock, over which is a mantellone or long purple cloak with hanging sleeves from the shoulders: but in the chapel, the mantellone is laid aside, and in its place they wear a red serge cappa or cloak with a hood of white ermine in winter, instead of which in summer, this hood which always hangs round the breast, shoulders, and back, is of red silk: with them, properly habited, are the Pope's chaplains, the secretary of briefs to princes, the secretary of Latin letters, the under secretary of state, the sub-datary, the master of the wardrobe, the cupbearer, the secretary of messages, and sometimes the physician. Besides the regular officers, there are a considerable number of supernumeraries and honorary chamberlains, honorary chaplains, and so forth. Such of this family as have no other places, sit in the chapel, on benches in front of the governor, and the prelates who are to his left. In the church, when the Pope celebrates solemnly, they sit on the side steps of the altar.

There are also private chamberlains of the sword and cloak, *di spada, e cappa,* who generally wear the black court dress, called Spanish; their number is unlimited, they are always laymen, four of whom are the ordinary or *partecipanti,* viz.: the master of the sacred dwelling, the grand herald or forerunner, *Foriere,* the grand esquire, and the superintendent of the post-office. The supernumerary and honorary, as well as the ordinary, when not otherwise engaged, do the service of the anti-chambers, conjointly with the ecclesiastical chamberlains;

they accompany his holiness on journeys and in processions, and frequently attend in the chapel. They are of the nobility.

The consistorial advocates are a very respectable body of lawyers, who furnish always gratuitous service for the poor, the imprisoned, and especially those under capital conviction. The promoter of the faith, the fiscal advocate, the advocate of the famous Roman people at the capitol, and a number of other respectable officers, are members of this body. They always furnish the orator for public consistories, and in private consistories make the demand of the *Pallium* for newly appropriated patriarchs and archbishops, and have several other dignified charges.—Over a black dress they wear a cloak not unlike a cappa, either black or purple, with a crimson hood. Their place is at the lower step at the right side of the throne.

On the back bench opposite the throne, next to the vicars-general of the mendicant orders, are the procurators-general: the next place is occupied by a capuchin friar, who is the preacher for the Papal family. Before the time of Benedict XIV., this preaching was the duty of a Dominican: the companion of the master of the sacred palace. A Servite, who is the confessor of the family, sits next to him, and is the last ecclesiastical officer on that bench. Below him are two proctors of the college: they belong to a body of eminent lawyers of excellent character, who plead the most important causes, especially those of the poor, in presence of his holiness.

A number of other officers and servants assist on the occasions of greatest solemnity.

The guard of nobles has existed since 1801, when a number of spirited young men of some of the best families offered their services to Pope Pius VII., to form a guard for his person; the offer was accepted; they were formed into two companies, and a section attends at the chapel, and forms at the entrance of the choir.

In the outer division of the Sistine chapel, there is, on the left hand side as you enter, an elevated platform, with seats for such members of foreign royal houses as might attend; the benches for ambassadors are in front of this, but much lower; and the front benches at the opposite side, which is appropriated to ladies, are for the families of the *corps diplomatique*. But no lady is allowed to enter this without a veil; neither are gentlemen permitted to attend the chapel, unless they be in dress and without canes or switches.

In the sacred functions of the altar, when the Pope assists without officiating, the three patriarchal basilics furnish their officers, who are selected by his holiness from a number of names presented by the

chapter of each, in which selection he always prefers a nobleman, if his other qualifications be equal to those of his associates.

The assistant-priest is furnished by St. John of Lateran.

The deacon, by the church of St. Peter.

The sub-deacon, by St. Mary Majors.

On solemn occasions, the priests penitentiaries of that basilic at which the chapel is held, attend in chasubles, next the mitred abbots. These are priests who speak the several languages, for the convenience of foreign penitents.

Palm Sunday. About nine o'clock on this morning, the Pope comes into the chapel, all the cardinals and other attendants being in their places. The custom for several centuries has been, for the cardinals to pay their homage to his holiness, as soon as he takes his seat upon the throne. This is performed by each going in succession, according to their orders, and the precedence of each in that order, to the foot of the throne, and bowing; then ascending to kiss the border of the cope which covers the Pope's right hand; again bowing, descending by the right side, and going to his place.

When this ceremony is concluded to-day, the cardinals, having been disrobed of their cappas or cloaks, are vested in the costume befitting the order of each, whether it be a cope or chasuble open or folded, the colour is violet, for it is a time of penance. The cardinals of religious orders not wearing rochets, put on surplices, before they take the amict and outer vestment.

The object of the ceremony is to enter this morning upon the recollection of the important and interesting fact of the Saviour's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when he was received by the multitude with palms, the emblem of victory, and with olives, which have been the type of peace, since the day that the returning dove brought this token of heavenly reconciliation to those prisoners who in the ark waited impatiently for the subsiding of the flood.

A quantity of branches of these or of other evergreens are placed at the Gospel side of the altar, under charge of two of the sacristan's attendants: seven pieces are placed upon the altar, three of which are smaller than the others.

The church wishes, as has been frequently explained, to sanctify everything which her children use, especially for the purposes of religion, by prayer and the word of God. The prayers read on this occasion, and all other days during the week, may be found in Latin and

Italian, in a work called *Uffizio della settimana santa, con versione Italiana di Monsig. Martini*, which is for sale at most of the booksellers.

The choir commences with the Hosanna as it was proclaimed by the children. In the next prayer which succeeds, the grace of God is besought to bring us to the glory of Christ's resurrection. The sub-deacon then chaunts from the book of *Exodus*, (chapters xv. and xvi.) the history of the murmurs of the children of Israel, after they had left the palm-trees and fountains of Elim, their regrets for having quitted the flesh-pots of Egypt, where they were in slavery, and the promise which the Lord gave them of manna; thus marking how, in the midst of these mortifications that we must meet, after occasional refreshments in our pilgrimage through life, we are too often disheartened by transient difficulties, and prefer returning to indulge our passions under the slavery of Satan: but God himself encourages us, not only by that better bread which came from heaven, but by the prospect of seeing the glory of the Lord in his holy mountain, after we shall have triumphed over sin.

The gradual, however, which follows this lesson, reverts to the conspiracy against Jesus, and his prayer in the garden of olives. The deacon, with the usual ceremonies, which have been explained in the exposition of the Mass, (page 328,) sings the Gospel, (*Matthew* xxi. from verse 1 to 11.)

After the Gospel, the second master of ceremonies gives the smaller branches to the sacristan, the deacon and sub-deacon, who presenting themselves at the foot of the throne, and bending their knees upon one of the lower steps, the sacristant being in the centre, remain holding the branches whilst the Pontiff reads the prayer of blessing.

In this, the church entreats of God to increase the light of faith for the greater triumph of religion, and brings before his view the blessings of increase which he bestowed upon Noe at his going out from the ark, and upon Moses at his coming forth from Egypt; she regards in this, as well the Catechumens who are preparing for the illumination of baptism, as the body of the faithful who are looking to the eucharist: and she desires that all bearing those branches, may meet Christ in the true spirit of their vocation, so that triumphing over sin, they may be enabled to bear the palm of victory, and secure for themselves reconciliation through the merits of the Saviour, by which they may obtain the olive of peace: and thus enter into the heavenly Jerusalem to live for ever. The choir chaunts the praises of the Eternal, in the *Trisagion*, or thrice holy. The blessing is then resumed by the Pontiff, in beautiful allusions to the peaceful dove returning with the olive to the ark, and to the people who bore the palms to meet Jesus, upon his approach

to Jerusalem. Whilst the sign of the cross is made over the branches, an entreaty is poured forth that God will bless all those who with pious sentiments shall carry them: and that this blessing may be extended to every place into which they shall be borne. The next prayer beautifully dwells upon the mystic lessons taught by the observance; and a short petition made in the true spirit of the church, beseeches that the lessons of spiritual religion which the emblematic ceremony was intended to teach, may be deeply impressed upon the minds of the beholders.

The incense and the holy water have been explained in the exposition of the Mass, (pages 317, 318,) the latter is here used to produce and to show the purifying influence of God's grace, the former to signify the good odour of virtue, and to urge us to send up our aspirations to that heaven towards which its fragrant smoke ascends.

The custom of blessing and distributing the palms is a very ancient observance of the church, though not originally universal. P. Merati has produced documents of the fourth or early in the fifth century, which show that the practice was then well known in Italy. The documents of the East show it to have been in use there at an earlier period. We can find no document of the English Church mentioning the custom previous to the eighth century. The manner of its celebration though having a general similarity in all places, yet differed in many lesser circumstances.

It was long usual in many churches, and is so still in several, to have a procession, with solemn prayers and hymns, on every Sunday previous to the celebration of Mass. In almost every place, a procession was formed on Palm Sunday, after the branches were blessed, for the purpose of representing the triumphal entry of the Saviour into Jerusalem, that by this observance a stronger impression might be made upon the faithful, and their curiosity being excited, that they should seek and obtain information respecting facts that were, for them, deeply interesting. This principle is the same that God himself taught to the Hebrew people. (*Deut.* vi. 20, and so forth) "And when thy son shall ask thee to-morrow, saying: what mean these testimonies, and ceremonies, and judgments which the Lord God hath commanded us? thou shalt say to him: we were bondsmen of Pharaoh in Egypt, and the Lord God brought us out of Egypt with a strong hand; and he wrought signs and wonders, great and very grievous in Egypt against Pharaoh and all his house in our sight, and he brought us out from thence, that he might bring us in and give us the land concerning which he sware to our fathers: and the Lord commanded that we should do all these ordinances, and should fear the Lord our God," and so forth.

Upon this same principle the Jewish Church instituted several festivals and solemnities, by the authority conferred upon her by God himself: and in like manner, by virtue of a similar power, given by the Saviour to the Christian Church. (*Matt.* xvi. 19, xxviii. 8; *John* xx. 21, and so forth), she has instituted several ceremonial solemnities for the purpose of impressing her children with a sense of the divine favours, and exciting them to proper dispositions of piety. Whilst this procession brought to their minds the occurrences at Jerusalem, it led them to contemplate in spirit, the triumphant march of the elect through time to eternity: but if they would have victory and peace, they must walk after the Saviour, in the road where he leads: his host must be marshalled under the standard of his cross, if it would seek to enter the heavenly Jerusalem. But alas! by the prevarication of our first parents, as well as by our own crimes, the gates of the celestial city are closed to prevent our ingress, until by the atonement of the cross they are opened, so that we can enter only through the blessed Jesus, by virtue of his merits, and by walking in that way which he has marked for our passage.

The Lord himself had prescribed (*Lev.* xxiii. 40), the very ceremonial with which the Saviour was received, though for a different object: the Prophet Zachary (ix. 9,) describes the manner of this entry. Profane authors, as well as sacred, inform us that the strewing of the garments was a testimony of extraordinary homage. Plutarch mentions it in his life of Cato of Utica, and in (*IV Kings* ix. 13,) it is mentioned as a token of royal dignity. The crowd from Jerusalem, therefore, received thus their Christ, because they hoped it was he that should have redeemed Israel. (*Luke* xxiv. 21.) And indeed it was for the very purpose of that redemption he came, though they as yet did not understand what is now manifest to us, that he ought to have suffered, and so enter into his glory.

In some places, the palms were blessed outside the city, and the procession was stopped at its entrance, by finding the gates closed, until they were opened after having been struck by the cross. Such used to be the case in Paris. In other churches, the Holy Eucharist, which contained Christ himself, was carried; such was the case at the famous abbey of Bec, in Normandy, as Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, informs us; this was observed in several others also: Matthew Paris, in his life of Abbot Simon, tells us the same rite was followed at St. Albans in England. The like was observed at Salisbury.

In other churches the Bible was carried: this was the case in most of the German churches; and generally in the Greek Church. The

antiquarian would find abundant documents to interest him on this subject. Formerly, the procession in Rome was not confined to the precincts of a hall or a palace: and at several stations the cross itself, as emblematic of the Saviour, was solemnly saluted.

We now return to the ceremony in the chapel. The blessing having been concluded, and the two voters of the signature who had charge of the holy water, and thurible having retired, the governor presents the branches which were held by the deacon and sub-deacon, and that held by the sacristan to the senior cardinal-bishop, who gives them to the Pope, by whom they are consigned, through the assistant cardinal-deacon, to his cupbearer. The master of ceremonies then gives one of them to the assistant-prince, who holds it during the entire ceremony. A richly embroidered veil, is now placed by a master of ceremonies on the knees of his holiness.

The cardinals then go in succession to the throne, to receive from the Pontiff the palm; each pays the proper homage by kissing the hand from which he receives the branch, the palm itself, and the right knee of the holy father. When they have all been served, they are succeeded by the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops assisting at the throne, wearing their mitres, who, kneeling, receive the palm, which they kiss, and then the right knee of the Pope: the archbishops and bishops, not assistant, follow next in order, similarly habited, and observe the same ceremony. The mitred abbots are next: instead of kissing the knee, they kiss the Pontiff's foot, as do all those who succeed them: the penitentiaries in their chasubles follow. The other members of the chapel come in the following order, viz.: the governor and the prince assistant, the auditor of the apostolic chamber, the major-domo, the treasurer, the prothonotaries-apostolic, the regent of the Chancery, the auditor of contradictions, the generals of the religious orders, the three conservators, and the prior of the Caporioni, the master of the sacred dwelling, the auditors of the Rota, the master of the sacred palace, the clerks of the chamber, the voters of the signature, the abbreviators, the priest-assistant to the celebrant, the deacon and sub-deacon, the masters of ceremony, the assistant chamberlains, the private chamberlains, the consistorial-advocates, the private chaplains, the ordinary chaplains, the extra chamberlains, the procurators-general of religious orders, the esquires, the chaunters, the assistant sacristan, the clerks and acolyths of the chapel, the chaplains of the cardinals, the porters, called *De Virga Rubea*. These are persons whose duty it was formerly to prepare the place upon which the Pope's vestments were laid, and to stand at the door as porters: at present they are two persons who attend to guard the papal cross;

they are clothed in purple cassocks, with cinctures and purple serge cloaks; they used to carry in their hands, as emblems of their office, staves about three feet long, covered with crimson velvet, tipped with silver, having, also, silver hoops round the middle; whence they are called of the *red rod*. The next are the mace-bearers who, over a plain black dress, wear a purple cloak, having edgings of black velvet, and cross-trimmings of black lace, bearing silver maces in their hands. They form a sort of guard for the Pontiff, and trace their origin to a guard of twenty-five men, assigned by the Emperor Constantine to Pope Sylvester. The students of the German College, in the last year of their theological course, follow, wearing red cassocks; after whom are such foreigners of distinction, if any, as have had their names inscribed on the list of the major-domo. Each makes the proper reverence to the altar, and to his holiness. The cardinal-deacon to the left of the throne assists in the distribution.

Towards the close of this ceremony six of the guard of nobles enter the choir, accompanied by the commander and other superior officers, and drawing up in front of the throne, they form into line, facing forwards to the chapel, having the mace-bearers on their left in oblique continuation.

During this distribution the choir performs the proper anthems in plain chaunt. In some places children sang the exclamations which, at the entrance of the Saviour, were repeated by the youth of Judea. The assistant-prince, attended by an auditor of the Rota, two clerks of the chamber, and two mace-bearers, presents the water, and the cardinal-dean holds the towel, whilst the Pope washes his hands. His holiness then says the proper prayer, after which he casts incense, given to him by the senior cardinal-priest, into the censer, which is held by the senior voter of the signature; the junior auditor of the Rota, in the vesture of a sub-deacon, mean time takes the cross, and goes to the foot of the throne; the senior cardinal-deacon then turning to the people chaunts, *Procedamus in pace*, "Let us go forward in peace." To which is given the answer *In nomine Christi, Amen.* "In the name of Christ, Amen." The procession begins to move. The cross is veiled, to exhibit the mourning of the church in the passion time.

The esquires are first, then the proctors of the college, next the procurators-general of religious orders, chaplains, consistorial-advocates, ecclesiastical-chamberlains, choristers or chaunters, abbreviators, voters of the signature, clerks of the chamber, auditors of the Rota, the thurifer, the sub-deacon with the veiled cross, upon the right transverse of which is an olive branch with a cross of palm: he has an acolyth with a lighted

candle at each side of him; he is followed by the penitentiaries, mitred abbots, bishops and cardinals. Then the lay-chamberlains, the herald, the master of the horse, the commissioned officers of the Swiss Guards, the commissioned officers of the guard of nobles, the master of the dwelling, conservators, constable, and governor. The Pope is borne on a seat carried by twelve supporters, under a canopy sustained by eight referendaries of the signature, clad in prelatic dress.

After him comes the dean of the Rota, between two chamberlains; then the auditor of the apostolic chamber, the treasurer, the majordomo, the prothonotaries-apostolic: the generals of the religious orders close the procession.

As they advance, the choir sings the passages taken from the Gospels, describing the occurrence which is commemorated. The *Sala Regia* is lined with the city militia, through whose ranks the procession moves, and as soon as the Pope enters this hall, the guard of nobles surround his seat, and two of the choristers go back to the chapel, the gates of which are closed. The procession turning to the right, continues round the hall, until having made the circuit, it again reaches the gate of the Sistine chapel. The beautiful hymn *Gloria, laus et honor* is sung in alternate verses by the chaunters, who remain inside, and the choir continues in the procession. This hymn is thought to have been composed by Theodulph, a French abbot, about the year 835, when he was confined in Angers, for having conspired with the sons of the Emperor Louis the pious, against their father; having been set at liberty, he was subsequently bishop of Orleans. Some, however, attribute it to Rinald, Bishop of Langres. A curious story is related of Theodulph's having obtained his release, by having sung this hymn as the emperor passed by the prison, in the procession of Palm Sunday.

The sub-deacon strikes with the staff of the cross, the door which has been closed, for the mystic reason previously given; it is then opened, and the procession enters, singing the verse "When the Lord entered into the holy city," and so forth.

This ceremony having been terminated, the cardinals, bishops, abbots and penitentiaries, who had worn sacred vestments, lay them aside, and take their ordinary dress of the chapel; then a cardinal-priest celebrates Mass.

The portion of the Gospel selected for this Mass, is the history of the passion of our Lord, as it is related by *St. Matthew*, in the chapters xxvi. xxvii.; but the mode in which it is chaunted, differs very much from the ordinary manner. Three deacons divide the history between them. The lessons which the spouse of the Saviour desires to teach,

are: that the author of blessing was slain for our iniquities: therefore the benediction is not asked as usual; no lights are borne before the book, for Christ the true light, which enlighteneth every man coming into this world, was for a time extinguished. No smoke of incense ascends, because the very piety and faith of the Apostles was wavering, for when the shepherd was stricken, the fold was scattered; no *Dominus vobiscum* is sung, because it was by a salute the traitor delivered Jesus into the hands of his enemies: nor is *Gloria tibi Domine* said, because the grief at beholding the Redeemer stripped of his glory, fills the hearts of the faithful.

The ancient mode of reciting tragedy was by one, and subsequently by two or more persons, who related the history in solemn chaunt. The way in which the passion is sung to-day, is a remnant of this ancient solemnity. The historical recital is by a tenor voice; that which was said by some of those concerned, and which is called *Ancilla,* because a portion of it consists of what was said by the servant maid to Peter, is by a voice in *contralto*; and those expressions used by the Saviour are in bass; the choir sings the words spoken by the crowd: and though the history is one of wo, still the palms are held during the recital, to show that it was by the suffering of Him by whose bruises we were healed, that the victory over death and hell has been achieved. But when the fact of his bowing down the head to give up the ghost, is related, all kneel, and in some churches they lie prostrate for some moments, in deep humiliation and solemn adoration of Him, who thus for our sakes was overwhelmed with the sorrows of death: in other churches they kiss the ground. The last five verses are sung by the deacon in the usual Gospel tone, after having received the blessing and incensed the book, but without having lights borne with the incense, for it is a joyless recital.

After the Gospel, the cardinals, standing in the centre of the chapel, recite the Nicene creed, their branches of palm are laid aside. The assistant-prince alone retains his, with the exception of the cupbearer, who has that of the holy father.

The beautiful hymn *Stabat Mater* is generally sung at the offertory of this Mass. Formerly the history of the passion was chaunted in Greek as well as in Latin, on this day.

The faithful, looking with confidence to the divine protection, which has been implored by the church, in favour of those who will bear these palms with proper dispositions, as also for the places into which they shall be carried; and revering besides, even those inanimate objects upon which the blessing of heaven has been specially invoked, and which are

used to aid the practice of religion, keep those branches with respect, not only as memorials of the great event which has caused their introduction, but also as occasions of blessings. They bear them upon their persons, and place them in their dwellings.

In the afternoon of this day, the cardinal grand penitentiary, goes in state to the church of St. John of Lateran, and is received by the canons in form; after which he goes to his confessional, and sits to receive any penitent that might present himself. This is at present merely a ceremony, continued as a testimony of ancient usage, from the time when the discipline of the church was more severe, and the public sinners and others were subjected to a severe course of public penance: an opportunity was afforded them at the approach of Easter, for such a reconciliation as would enable them to receive the holy Eucharist.

Wednesday: The office of this afternoon properly belongs to Thursday; hence, in the book which has been previously mentioned, it is under the head of *Giovedi Santo.*

From the days of the Apostles, the church has prescribed for her clergy a divine office; that is, a duty of attendance upon the Lord. This duty was one of prayer.

Amongst the ancients, the night was divided into four watches, and the day into four stations; so that the military who were appointed to the guard duty, relieved each other at the termination of each watch or station. In several of the Christian churches, the soldiers of the Lord emulated those of the emperors, in the assiduity of their service, and the court of the heavenly monarch was never without adorers. The fervent men who were our predecessors in the faith, looked upon themselves, indeed, as merely passengers upon earth; they regarded heaven as their true country, and already they aspired by their psalms and their hymns, to unite with those choirs of the blessed, amongst whom they expected to dwell for eternity. The royal psalmist declares (*Ps.* cxviii. 62), that he rose at midnight to give praise to the Lord. Pliny the younger, Lucian, and Ammianus Marcellinus, mention the custom of the Christians to sing and watch at night. Lactantius tells us that they did so, to prepare for the arrival of their king and God. But St. John Chrysostom tells us, that the people were not called to these night offices except on Sundays, and other solemn occasions. However, in the monasteries and amongst the clergy, the *course*, which was its appellation, was regularly performed; and as the canons regulated the time and manner of the performance, the hours and subsequently the office, came to be known by the appellation of the "canonical hours."

The discipline on this head was not everywhere exactly the same, but there was a striking similarity. The hours of the night were called *Nocturns.* On ordinary occasions, there was only one nocturn or night-watch; but on very solemn occasions there were three. At this assembly, a number of psalms were chaunted, after which some scriptural or other sacred lessons were read, and a prayer sometimes offered. When there were several nocturns, this same custom was observed at each. The office of the night, on solemn occasions, latterly consisted of three nocturns, at the first of which three psalms were chaunted, and three lessons of the Old Testament were read; after each of which lessons, an appropriate responsory or answer was sung. At the second nocturn, three other psalms were chaunted, and three lessons were read from the writings of some pious and learned prelate, or from the history of the martyrdom and virtues of those whose festival was celebrated. At the third nocturn, they sung three other psalms, and read some lessons of the New Testament. On Sunday, the number of psalms for the first nocturn, was sometimes nine, and sometimes even more.

The ancients had given the name of Matuta to a fictitious deity, whom the Greeks called Leucothea or the "white Goddess." In the latter time of the Roman republic, she was called Aurora. Hence the period of morning was called *ad Matutinum tempus.* The Christians began just before day-break their praises in the performance of four psalms and a canticle: this office was called *Laudes ad Matutinum,* or the praises for the morning. A variety of reasons conspired to introduce, subsequently, the practice of assembling just before dawn, to perform the offices of night and day-break, instead of continuing the vigils or night-watches, and all this portion of the office came, therefore, to be known as that of *Matins and Lauds.* But in some monasteries of strict observance, they preserve the ancient custom of rising to matins, with some occasional relaxation at midnight; in others they postpone the hour.

Previously to the introduction of bells, the faithful were invited to these offices principally by the clapping of boards. Some new portions were from time to time added to the mere psalms and lessons. Thus, antiphons or passages fit to express the peculiar object of the solemnity were chaunted before and after each psalm. At the end of the lesser doxology, "Glory be to the Father," and so forth, was added; a short passage consonant to the sentiments befitting the festival, was sung in a more lively strain, and it was caller a *versicle*—because, during its performance, they turned to the altar, *versus altare,* and the response or answer was in the same tone. The president repeated the Lord's prayer, and also a short deprecatory form called the absolution, because

it absolved or finished the psalms of that nocturn; and each reader besought a blessing before he commenced his lesson. Besides, the president at the commencement entreated the Lord to open his lips, that his mouth might announce the Creator's praise. He also invited the special aid of God; a joyful invitatory psalm, with appropriate versicles and responsories, was sung to excite the fervour of the assembly; and a hymn, generally in lyric measure, and with varied modulations, preceded the first nocturn. The *Te Deum* followed the last lesson; and a little chapter of festivity, with a suitable hymn before the canticle and its prayer, terminated the Lauds.

A proper office was also celebrated at the first, third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day, as also at vespers or sunset; and complin, or the filling up of the entire duty, formed the conclusion of the service, before retiring to repose.

For a long period after the vigils were generally discontinued, the faithful used to assemble, at midnight for the nocturns of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of the Holy week; but, for some centuries, the office has been always celebrated in the afternoon of the preceding day. Thus, in an ancient Roman *Ordo* we read: "On Wednesday afternoon, the Lord Pope comes at a proper hour to the office of matins in a cloak of scarlet, with a hood over his forehead, not folded back, and without a mitre."

On these days the church rejects from her office all that has been introduced to express joy. The first invocations are omitted, no invitatory is made, no hymn is sung, the nocturn commences by the antiphon of the first psalm; the versicle and responsory end the choral chaunt, for no absolution is said; the lessons are also said without blessing asked or received; no chapter at Lauds, but the *Miserere* follows the canticle, and precedes the prayer, which is said without any salutation of the people by the *Dominus vobiscum*, even without the usual notice of *Oremus*. The celebrant also lowers his voice towards the termination of the petition itself; thus, the *Amen* is not said by the people, as on other occasions, nor is the doxology found in any part of the service.

This office is called *tenebræ*, or darkness. Authors are not agreed as to the reason. Some inform us that the appellation was given, because formerly it was celebrated in the darkness of midnight; others say that the name is derived from the obscurity in which the church is left at the conclusion of the office, when the lights are extinguished. The only doubt which suggests itself regarding the correctness of this latter derivation, arises from the fact, that Theodore, the archdeacon of the holy Roman Church, informed Amalarius, who wrote about the

year 840, that the lights were not extinguished in his time in the Church of St. John of Lateran on holy Thursday; but the context does not make it so clear that the answer regarded this office of matins and lauds, or if it did, the Church of St. John then followed a different practice from that used by most others, and by Rome itself for many ages since.

The office of Wednesday evening, then, is the matins and lauds of Thursday morning in their most simple and ancient style, stripped of every circumstance which could excite to joy, or draw the mind from contemplating the grief of the Man of Sorrows. At the epistle side of the sanctuary, however, an unusual object presents itself to our view. It is a large candlestick, upon whose summit a triangle is placed; on the side ascending to the apex of this figure are fourteen yellow candles, and one on the point itself. Before giving the explanation generally received, respecting the object of present introduction, we shall mention what has been said by some others. These lights, and those upon the altar, are extinguished during the office. All are agreed that one great object of this extinction is to testify grief and mourning. Some writers, who appear desirous of making all our ceremonial find its origin in mere natural causes, tell us that it is but the preservation of the old-fashioned light which was used in former times when this office was celebrated at night,—and that the present gradual extinction of its candles, one after the other, is also derived from the original habit of putting out the lights successively, as the morning began to grow more clear, until the brightness of full day enabled the readers to dispense altogether with any artificial aid. These gentlemen, however, have been rather unfortunate in causing all this to occur in the catacombs, into which the rays of the eastern sun could not easily find their way, at least with such power as to supersede the use of lights. They give us no explanation of the difference of colour in the candles which existed, and still exists, in many places,—the upper one being white, and the others yellow, nor of the form of this triangle. Besides, in some churches, all the candles were extinguished at once, in several by a hand made of wax, to represent that of Judas; in others they were all quenched by a moist spunge passing over them, to show the death of Christ; and on the next day, fire was struck from a flint, by which they were again kindled, to show his resurrection. Some of the writers inform us that all the lower lights were emblematic of the Apostles and other disciples of the Saviour, who, at the period that his sufferings grew to their crisis, became terrified by his arrest, his humiliations, his condemnation, and crucifixion, as well as by the supernatural exhibitions upon Calvary, and in Jerusalem; and that the extinction shows the terror and doubts

by which they were overwhelmed; but that the Blessed Virgin, who is represented by the candle upon the summit, and which was not extinguished, alone retained all her confidence unshaken, and with a clear and perfect expectation of his resurrection, yet plunged in grief, beheld the appalling spectres that came, as from another world, to bear testimony of a deicide in this.

The number of lights was by no means everywhere the same. In some, there was a candle corresponding to each psalm, and to each lesson of the office. Thus, in some we read of twenty-four wax lights, and a number of lamps; in others, of thirty; in some twelve, in some nine, in some only seven; whilst, in other churches, every person had leave to bring as many as he thought proper; and in some churches they were extinguished at once,—in others at two, three, or more intervals. In the church of Canterbury, according to the statutes of Lanfranc, the number was twenty-five,—but, since the twelfth century, the custom has become pretty general of having fifteen upon the triangle, and six upon the altar. In the Sixtine chapel, there are also six upon the balustrade, which, however, are extinguished by a beadle, at the same time that those upon the altar are put out by the master of ceremonies; nor is the candle upon the point of the triangle, in this chapel, of a different colour from the others; the usual custom of the church has been, to use unpurified wax for her lights on days of mourning and penance.

The explanation which appears to us most instructive, is that which informs us that the candles which are ranged along the sides of this triangle represent the patriarchs and prophets, who, under the law of nature and the written law, gave the world the light of that imperfect revelation which they received, but all tending towards one point, which was Christ the Messias, He that was promised; as not only the one in whom all nations should be blessed, but who, as the orient on high, was to shed the beams of knowledge upon those minds that had been so long enveloped in darkness. As these lights are extinguished, one at the end of each psalm, so were these chosen ones, after having proclaimed the praises of the Redeemer, consigned to death, many of them by the people whom they instructed. Towards the termination of the office, the lights upon the altar are also put out, whilst the choir recites the last verses of the canticle of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist,—a canticle in which that priest first proclaimed the praises of the Lord, the glories of the Saviour, and the office of his own son, when his dumbness was terminated upon the circumcision and naming of the child that was to be the precursor.

This John was the last of the prophetic band, but his light was more

resplendent than that of any of his predecessors,—because, upon the banks of the Jordan, he pointed out the Lamb of God, that came to take away the sins of the world; and because he sent his disciples from his prison to receive, from Jesus himself, the testimony of those miraculous works, by the performance of which, the prophecies regarding him were made manifest. Thus was he more than a prophet, by his demonstration of the Christ. John, then, was also consigned to the grave by Herod, and Jesus remained, with the eyes of all Judea fixed upon him, now that he was clearly established in the full and unrivalled possession of the character of Him who was to be sent, of Him who was expected, of Him whose day Abraham longed to see, and beholding it rejoiced, for he had done works which no other had done, and there was no excuse for the unbelievers. The conspiracy is successful; the traitor delivers him, the ceremony corresponds to this; for now the remaining candle is concealed under the altar at the epistle side, the prayer is in silence, the psalm beseeching mercy is sung, the last petition is made, and a sudden noise reminds us of the convulsions of nature at the Saviour's death, when, crying out with a loud voice, he gave up the ghost; whilst the affrighted sun drew back, the moon was covered with dark clouds, the veil of the temple, by its rent, opened the way for this eternal High Priest to bear his own blood into that sanctuary which it had hitherto concealed; and the very rocks afforded, by their new chasms, an egress for those who had been long entombed, to come forth and exhibit themselves in the agitated city. But this light has not been extinguished, it has only been covered for a time; it will be produced, still burning and shedding its light around. Yes! the third day will see the Saviour resuscitated, and beaming his effulgence on the world.

With these explanations it is trusted that the ceremony of this afternoon will be intelligible and instructive, especially to those who, providing themselves with office books, can enter into the spirit of the psalms and lessons, as well as of the ceremonial itself.

The Pope wears a reddish-purple cope of satin, and mitre of silver cloth, or a red serge cappa, the hood of which he throws over his head, if he should lay aside his mitre. The cardinals are in violet cassocks and cappas; the other attendants in their usual dress.

The antiphon of the first psalm is intoned in soprano, which the choir takes up; the psalms are scarcely chaunted; they are rather said in a subdued note; after the versicle, the *Pater noster* is said in a low voice. The first lesson is taken from the Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremias, in which, under the name of the daughter of Sion, he bewails the desolation of that Jerusalem over which Jesus Christ wept. Four

voices sing this in parts; the second and third lessons are from the same book; they are performed in plain chaunt. At the conclusion of each lesson, the choir, in the name of the church, calls pathetically, and with emphasis, upon the Jewish synagogue, and generally upon all sinners to be converted; the invitation is, "Jerusalem! Jerusalem! O turn to the Lord thy God!" The responsories to each lesson are sung by some of the choristers. The lessons of the second nocturn are a portion of the homily of St. Augustin on the fifty-fourth psalm, and those of the third nocturn are that portion of the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians which relates to the institution of the blessed eucharist by the Saviour, on the night that he was betrayed.

After these lessons and their proper responsories, the office of lauds commences. The proper antiphon, "Thou wilt be justified, O Lord! in thy words, and shalt overcome when thou art judged," precedes the psalm *Miserere*. When the other psalms and the canticle of Moses after the passage of the Red Sea have been concluded, and all the candles on the stand have been extinguished, save the one on the summit of the triangle, the versicle is sung; the antiphon to the canticle of Zachary, "The traitor gave them a sign, saying, whomsoever I shall kiss is he, hold ye him," is performed; the canticle itself called from its first word *Benedictus* is next sung, then the antiphon is repeated. When the lights upon the altar, and those upon the balustrade have been extinguished, the holy father comes down from his throne, and whilst two treble voices sing the versicle which follows: "Christ was made for us obedient even unto death," he kneels, the Lord's prayer is secretly said, after which four voices sing the *Miserere* of Allegri in alternate verses, but they all join in the last passage, with other voices, which dying away seem about to be lost, until they again rise upon the concluding notes. The Pontiff now reads the closing prayer, the last words of which are scarcely audible, and a noise succeeds, like that which we are informed was made in the Jewish assemblies when in reading the book of Esther the name of Aman was mentioned. It is significant of that confusion of nature, which occurred at the Redeemer's death, when the centurion, and they who were with him returned into the city, declaring that indeed he was the Son of God; many striking their breasts, bewailed their offences and were truly converted. Such are the sentiments in which the church desires her children should depart from this office.

On this evening, at about half after four o'clock, the cardinal grand penitentiary goes in state to the residence of the Dominican penitentiaries attached to the basilic of St. Mary Major's; accompanied by them, he proceeds to the church itself, where he is formally received by

four of the canons; after using the holy water, he is accompanied to the confessional. This, as was remarked respecting a similar form on Sunday afternoon, is now a mere ceremony. In most churches, the public penitents were formerly brought before the bishop, after matins on holy Thursday, and after the seven penitential psalms, the litanies of the saints, and other prayers had been said, or sung, they received what was called the first absolution. In many places they received the second absolution after the third, or ninth hour, and dined with the bishop in the evening. In the church of Salisbury in England, the reconciliation was after the ninth hour. The archdeacon prayed the bishop in the name of the penitents at the church door, to admit them to favour, and the ceremony was interesting and edifying.

On the afternoon of this and the two following days, it is usual at the hospital della Trinita, for many respectable persons, among whom will frequently be found cardinals and prelates, to wait at table upon pilgrims, who are received to hospitality in this establishment for some days, whilst they perform their religious duties. The same acts of humility and charity are performed by some of the most respectable and religious ladies of Rome, in a separate apartment for the female pilgrims, who at this solemn time come to indulge their devotion in the holy city. The sentiments which in this season befit all classes, are, indeed, those of penitence, humility, charity, condescension, kindness, mutual respect, and affability.

Thursday: It is called *Maundy Thursday*, from the *mandatum* or command given by the Saviour for washing the feet. It was usual in many places formerly to celebrate three masses on this day; at the first, the public penitents were reconciled; at the second, the oils were consecrated; at the third, there was a more solemn celebration than usual, to honour the anniversary of that day on which our Saviour instituted the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and the blessed eucharist. Now in general, only one Mass is celebrated in each church, and if it be a cathedral, the oils are usually blessed, and the clergy go to communion, on which occasion they receive of course, only under the appearance of bread.

St. Augustin mentions the custom in his time of having two masses on this day; one was celebrated in the morning by a priest who, as usual, was fasting, and another in the evening, by a priest who was not fasting; at which latter, persons who had eaten went to communion. The holy doctor neither censures nor approves the custom. The third council of Carthage in its thirty-ninth canon permits the celebration of Mass, only on this day, by a priest who had eaten; as did also the coun-

cil of Constantinople, (in Trullo,) for that part only of Africa, in which the custom had been long established. The rite of this day differed very greatly not only in several churches, but in the same church at several periods; thus we find by the pontifical of Egbert, Bishop of York, by that of Turpin, Archbishop of Rheims, and by the Ordo of Pope Gelasius, that one of the masses of this day had no collect. However, these varieties belong not to our present purpose.

This being the anniversary of the eucharistic institution, and of the Saviour's washing his disciples' feet, we shall hastily advert to the facts that occurred. The passover or paschal time, was the anniversary of the liberation of the people of Israel from Egypt, and they, every year, by a divine ordinance eat the paschal supper, to commemorate this deliverance, which occurred after their fathers had eaten the flesh of a lamb, sacrificed in the perfection of his age; this victim was a figure of Jesus, the true lamb who takes away the sins of the world, and who was slain towards evening without breaking a bone in his body, and whose blood is sprinkled, not upon the material door-posts, but upon the souls of those whom he desires to save from the destroying angel, and to whom he gave the command that they should eat the flesh of that very lamb by whose blood they are redeemed. This Jewish ceremony was then, not only a commemoration of the deliverance of their fathers, but also a figure of the Saviour's death, and of the institution of the holy sacrifice, and of the blessed sacrament of the eucharist. The Saviour went up to Jerusalem to accomplish the redemption, whilst he also, in so doing, fulfilled the ancient figures. The evangelists relate to us how he sent his disciples to prepare this paschal supper. (*Matt.* xxvi. 18, and so forth). At this celebration he told them how he had desired to eat this passover with them before he suffered, because he was not to have any other celebration until he would establish in its stead the new ordinance in the kingdom of God, that is the Christian institution in which the figure should be fulfilled. (*Luke* xxii. 15, 16). After concluding this legal, ritual supper, he gave them, as was thereat usual, wine to divide amongst them, declaring that he would not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God, that is, the new institution for the Christian law should arrive. (*Luke* xxii. 17, 18). An ordinary repast, as was customary, followed this Israelitic celebration; and whilst they were eating this meal, he published how one of them was about to betray him, (*Matt.* xxvi. 21, and so forth), and gave to John the private intimation, showing who would be the traitor. (*John* xiii. 23, 24, 25, 26). And when he had done this supper, (*John* xiii. 2), he got up from the table, and laying aside his outer garments, he girded himself with

a towel, and pouring water into a basin, he washed the feet of his disciples; desiring then that his grace should make them wholly and perfectly free from crime, that they might receive with benefit, what he was about to bestow in the holy sacrament, though, unfortunately, they would not all profit by his grace. (*John* xiii. 10, 11). They had not risen, but were yet at the supper table, (*Matt.* xxvi. 26), and some of them might have been still eating, (*Mark* xv. 22), but the Saviour had supped, (*I Cor.* xi. 25), when he took the bread and wine, which he blessed and changed, and offered to his Father, giving thanks, and distributed to them, declaring, that under these appearances was that body which was given for them, (*Luke* xxii. 19), and that blood which should be shed for many for the remission of sins, (*Matt.* xxvi. 28), and then he gave them power to do what he had done, for the purpose of a commemoration of him, or of showing forth his death until his second coming. (*I Cor.* xi. 24, 25, 26).

The ceremonies of this day regard altogether the facts here related. The church even in the midst of her grief, allows on this day, some joy and gratitude for the mighty boon conferred on her children in this divine institution. Upon entering the chapel, therefore, its symptoms will at once be seen. Though her ornaments are veiled, yet they are covered with white, and the altar is somewhat ornamented; the candles are also of white wax. The cardinal-dean generally celebrates Mass.

As the peculiar ceremonies of the chapel where the Pope assists at Mass, have not been previously described, they shall be noticed in the account that is here given of that which is celebrated to-day.

The Mass. The cardinals, as they arrive, take their purple cappas, or cloaks with ermine, in the *Sala Regia*, or royal hall; each is assisted by his chaplains, and when habited, a mace-bearer precedes his eminence as far as the balustrade; he is met by a master of ceremonies at the entrance of the choir; after going into which, he makes a short prayer, then rising, he pays his respects to his brethren on each side, who also rise to return his salute; after which he goes to his proper seat.

Shortly before the time for the arrival of his holiness, the prelate who is to celebrate the Mass, properly habited and attended, comes from the sacristy, by the door beyond the altar. After making the proper reverence to the altar, and to the cardinals, who make a suitable return, he goes to his seat near the credence table, there to await the arrival of the holy father.

The chamberlains and other attendants precede the Pope, who immediately follows his cross. On this day he wears a white cope, and a

mitre of cloth of gold. Two cardinal-deacons as usual attend him, and he is followed by the assistant-prince, the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops assistant at the throne, with the dean of the Rota, and two chamberlains. Turning to his left hand as he passes the celebrant, he gives him his benediction, and advances to the choir, then turning to the right and left, he gives his blessing to the cardinals and others who are in the chapel. The cardinal deacon takes off the Pope's mitre, which he gives to the dean of the Rota; his holiness kneels before the altar at a place prepared for that purpose; after making a short private prayer he rises, and having the celebrant on his left hand, makes the sign of the cross, and begins the preparatory antiphon and psalm *Judica*, which is resumed this day: being answered by the celebrant, his holiness recites the form of confession, and after the celebrant answers and confesses, the holy father continues to lead in the prayers, until the conclusion of this preparatory form at the foot of the altar, when having resumed his mitre, and blessed the cardinals, he goes to sit upon his throne. When he is seated towards the close of the introit, the cardinals come down from their seats to the centre of the chapel, and go to pay the pontiff the usual homage. When the first cardinal-priest has performed it, he, with the usual ceremonies, gives his holiness the incense to bless and to cast into the censer, after which the thurible is taken to the attending deacon, who gives it to the celebrant for the purpose of perfuming the altar. The two cardinal-deacons, who assist at the throne, have their cappas rolled up, so as to be more at liberty to serve. As soon as the homage is paid, the first cardinal-priest, having received the thurible, kneels at the foot of the throne and incenses the pontiff. The book is now held for the Pope by one of the assistant-patriarchs or bishops, and anoither holds the candle whilst the holy father reads.

On this day, too, the *Gloria in excelsis* is sung, though in more ancient statutes, such as those of Lanfranc for the church of Canterbury; this hymn was not to be sung except at the Mass, when the oils were blessed. It is not usual to ring the bell at the Sixtine Chapel, but in other places, it is rung this day during the repetition of the *Gloria in excelsis*, which has not been previously said in the masses of the time of penance, that is since before Septuagesima Sunday, nor is the bell now rung from this moment until the repetition of this hymn on Saturday, with the exception of the moment of the papal benediction. All the bells in Rome, even those of the clocks, are silent during that time, as symbolic of grief and affliction; and boards are clapped, in the old fashion, to invite persons to the religious offices. Some writers go so

far as to say, that the bells represent the preachers, who are silent now that the author of their mission is himself, led like a lamb to the slaughter, without opening his mouth to complain. The fact, however, would not sustain this symbolic interpretation, because though the bells are dumb the preachers speak.

The college of cardinals also surround the holy father, whilst with him they repeat the hymn of angelic praise.

The reverence which would be paid by the sub-deacon after singing the epistle, is paid to his holiness; to him also the deacon applies for the blessing before the Gospel, to him the sub-deacon carries the book to be kissed after that Gospel has been sung, and at its termination the senior cardinal-priest incenses the pontiff. When there is a sermon, the preacher attended by a master of ceremonies goes at this time, to ask for the papal benediction; at the end of the discourse, the door of the chancel which had been closed at its commencement is opened, and the deacon chaunts the *Confiteor* for the indulgence: there is seldom, however, a sermon on this day in the chapel.

When the celebrant intones the creed, the cardinals and other attendants in the chapel, recite it as they do the first psalm, the Kyrie eleison, the Gloria in excelsis, and so forth, by pairs, those next to each other, turning, each a little towards his companion: at the creed also they surround the holy father.

After the offertory he blesses the incense, which is then carried to the celebrant to be used at the altar; this being done, his deacon incenses the prelate who celebrates Mass. The censer is carried to the first cardinal-priest, who incenses the Pope kneeling, if he be seated, and standing if the Pope rises, not merely as a testimony of his supremacy in the church, but also of his sovereignty in the state. The same usage existed at Milan, whilst the archbishop of that see was also sovereign of the state. The deacon having received the thurible, incenses the cardinals, bishops, and so forth, in the proper order of their precedence.

At the end of the preface, the cardinals again meet in the middle of the chapel to repeat the *Trisagion*, after which they receive the Pope's benediction, and go to kneel in their proper places; the holy father comes down to kneel before the altar; twelve esquires in red, come out from the sacristy with lighted torches, and kneel on both sides of the sanctuary during the consecration; on other occasions four at most attend: after the consecration, the holy father, taking his mitre, returns to the platform of his throne, where he remains standing, unmitred, until after the communion. When the celebrant sings the *Pater noster*, the cardinals again coming to the centre of the floor, remain until they say

the *Agnus Dei*; but this day the kiss of peace is not given, because it was by a kiss that Judas betrayed his Lord, and indeed, independently of this, the great solemnity is one of joy, yet a weight of sorrow presses upon the mind throughout the offices; and no kiss of peace was given formerly on days of grief and mourning.

Soon after the consecration, the masters of ceremony begin the distribution of the candles for the procession peculiar to the day, and several of the prelates leave the chapel during the *Pater noster*, in order to put off their cloaks and take surplices.

The celebrant consecrates on this day, two particles of the sacred host, one to be consumed as usual at the Mass, the other to be carried in procession to the Pauline chapel and kept until next day, when it is brought back and consumed at the office of Good Friday. The procession which now is in a state of preparation is for this accompaniment. In some very ancient documents we find that the particle thus reserved, was not carried away as now is the custom, but was placed with the greatest reverence behind the altar. In the old formularies of the Cistercians we read that it was placed in a ciborium, which was suspended, according to the very ancient usage, over the altar. The Carthusians in their regulations prescribe, that there shall be no such splendid monuments in their churches as are used by the seculars for keeping the sacrament on this occasion, as they say, that splendour befits not their solitude, but that the eucharist shall be kept at the altar in the usual manner. Lanfranc of Canterbury, in his statutes, directs that it shall be kept in a place prepared carefully, in the most becoming manner, and to which it shall be borne by a procession with lights, that it shall be incensed before and after, and the lights kept continually burning at the place.

The Procession. This being the anniversary of the institution, the devotion of the faithful to the Holy Sacrament, naturally exhibits itself in the affectionate and respectful gratitude which they feel towards Him, who about to close His mortal career, left us in this divine institution the pledge and token of His most tender affection. On this day, they commemorate His humiliations, and reflect upon their own manifold transgressions of His law and offences of His person; they therefore desire to give some expression of their anxiety to do Him homage and to aid their own feelings of devotion. It is for this purpose that they have for so many centuries continued to marshal this procession, to prepare a repository where this Holy Sacrament might receive from them the tokens of their homage, and where they might approach to

their hidden God, to render Him that adoration which angels joyously pay.

The cardinals and bishops at the conclusion of the Mass also change their vesture, and the procession is then formed in the same order that it was on Palm Sunday.

The cross is covered with a purple veil, the sub-deacon who bears it, goes outside the chancel to the hall of the chapel, and the choir commences the beautiful hymn *Pange Lingua*; the holy father having paid his reverence to the sacrament, receives the vessel which contains it, enveloped himself with the veil in which he folds it. Bare headed and with incense burning before him, he proceeds towards the *Sala Regia*, following the bishops and cardinals who as well as the others, bear lights; all who are not in the procession, as the Pope passes, kneel. Whatever their private opinions may be, none should insult by their irreverent or indecorous conduct, those, who in their own house, follow the institutions of their fathers, in paying homage to their God. No difference of opinion, no notions of superior wisdom or of clearer light, can warrant an intrusion of strangers for the purposes of gratifying curiosity at the expense of their feelings, whose chapel is thus invaded. The admission is a concession of courtesy, which every well educated, every correctly informed mind will know how to appreciate. A decorous external conformity is expected, as the least tribute which justice can accept, and it is one which every person, having the ordinary feelings of delicacy, will gladly pay. They who cannot afford so much, must be poor indeed. They would do well not to intrude. The readers of this are presumed generally to be persons of liberal education; to them it is sufficient to intimate, that nothing is more offensive to Catholics than a transgression of the principle here alluded to.

The sala regia is lighted up with twelve cornucopiæ of wax candles, the procession moves to the Pauline chapel which is at the termination of this hall, on the right hand as you leave the Sixtine. The repository for the Holy Sacrament is prepared in this chapel, which is illuminated with nearly six hundred wax candles, and appropriately ornamented. As soon as the Pope enters it, the choir begins with the strophe of *Verbum caro*: and when the Pontiff arrives at the altar, the cardinal deacon kneeling, receives from him the chalice which contains the Holy Sacrament, and accompanied by the proper attendants, carries it to the place prepared for it, where the sacristan fixes it in the vessel prepared for that purpose. The deacon having returned, the cardinal-priest serves the incense, with which the Pope perfumes the Holy Sacrament, and the sacristan closes the door of the repository which he locks, giving the key

to the cardinal grand penitentiary, who is to celebrate the next day. The *Tantum Ergo* is sung during this ceremony; and all rise from their knees at its conclusion.

The chapel is called the Pauline, from having been built by Pope Paul III. about the year 1540, as the Sixtine has its name from Pope Sixtus IV. by whom it was built in 1773. Previous to the erection of the Pauline chapel, the ceremony was not so solemn, as it has been since that period.

The name of sepulchre has been generally given by the faithful to the repository in which the Sacrament is kept, and they generally visit this in remembrance of the body of Christ having reposed in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. Piety it is true might be thus indulged, but it is an inversion of order; for the church has not yet commemorated the crucifixion. The sacrament is removed in order that the faithful may have an opportunity of indulging their devotion towards the holy Eucharist in a place where it reposes in state, on the anniversary of its institution; whilst the principal altar is thus left free, and again stripped of its decoration at vespers, so as to exhibit the desolation of the Passion.

The Papal Benediction. Is given from the gallery at the front of St. Peter's. Strangers who wish to see the ceremony of the washing of feet, had better omit altogether going to see this benediction, as they will have another opportunity on Sunday, of seeing one similar, without any interference with other ceremonies.

When the holy father has concluded the ceremony in the Pauline chapel, the procession goes in the same order, through the door at the angle, on the right of that chapel as you come out, to the *loggia* or gallery in front of the church of St. Peter's, which is hung with damask, and otherwise decorated. The Pope is carried in his chair upon the platform borne by supporters, under a canopy supported by eight prelates-referendaries: he wears his mitre, and two of his attendants carry the *flabelli*, or large fans of feathers. When the holy father is brought forward to the gallery, the troops of the city are drawn up in order of grand parade, cavalry and infantry; and an immense crowd fill the space before this splendid edifice. The pontiff that now appears before them, is the successor of him, to whom eighteen centuries ago, the eternal Son of God declared, (*Matt.* xvi. 17, 18, 19), "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall also be bound in

heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall also be loosed in heaven." This is the successor of him to whom the same Jesus said on the night when he was betrayed, (*Luke* xxii. 31, 32), "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have thee, that he might sift thee as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." This is the successor of him whom after his resurrection, the same Saviour commissioned (*John* xxi. 15, 16, 17) to feed, not only his lambs, but the very sheep, from whom, they receive the milk of heavenly doctrine. Frail and imperfect as every mortal necessarily is, yet must we, (*I Cor.* iv) account him as "the minister of Christ, the dispenser of the mysteries of God." Viewing him in this light, the multitude desire his blessing on this memorable day, as Abraham desired the blessing of Melchisedec.

The pontiff, feeling that though vested with power to bless, yet prayer will also be beneficial, seeks to obtain aid through the powerful intercession of the blessed spirits that surround the throne of God, before he rises to perform this act of his sacred authority. The following is a translation of the form of prayer, which he uses.

"May the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, in whose power and authority we place confidence, intercede for us with the Lord. Amen."

"We ask through the prayers and merits of the blessed Mary ever virgin, of the blessed John the Baptist, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, that the Almighty God may have mercy upon you, and that all your sins being forgiven, Jesus Christ would bring you to eternal life. Amen."

"May the almighty and merciful Lord bestow upon you, indulgence, absolution, and remission of all your sins, opportunity of true and fruitful penitence, hearts always contrite, penitent, and amendment of life, grace and consolation of the Holy Ghost, and final perseverance in good works. Amen."

Then rising and thrice making the sign of the cross over the multitude, at the mention of the persons of the sacred Trinity, and turning towards the front and each side, he prays:

"And may the blessing of Almighty God, Father, + Son, + and Holy Ghost, + descend upon you and remain for ever. Amen."

One of the cardinal-deacons then reads in Latin, and the other in Italian, the notice signifying that to all those who have attended with proper dispositions of true repentance, and are in the state of friendship with God, the Pope grants a plenary indulgence. Printed notices to this effect are also cast down to the crowd. The amen is four times sung. The military bands strike up their responsive salutation, the

bells of St. Peter's proclaim the blessing to the surrounding city, and the artillery of the castle of St. Angelo send the tidings in reverberating echoes to the Sabine hills.

The attendants now change their dresses, laying aside those they had taken for the procession and resuming the ordinary costume of the chapel, and his immediate attendants accompany the Pope to the apartment, whither he is borne for the purpose of preparing for the next ceremony.

For a long period previous to the year 1740, the bull generally called *In Cœna Domini*, used to be published in Latin and Italian on this ocasion from the gallery. This bull contained, amongst other clauses, the announcement of that excommunication to which all that departed from the unity of the church, unfortunately subjected themselves. Like many other customs this has been often grossly misrepresented. It is stated by writers, of otherwise respectable characters, to be an imprecation of the vengeance of heaven upon persons who conscientiously reject what they are pleased to call the errors of the Church of Rome. The spirit of malediction is not that of the spouse of Jesus Christ. He did not, nor does she imprecate the wrath of God upon those whose departure she lamented, over whose aberrations she wept, for whose conversion she laboured and she prayed, and whose return she would hail with that tender rapture which St. Luke so pathetically describes. (xv. 20.) She however warned them in the spirit of candour and sincerity of the evils by which they were surroundeed, and in the ceremony of extinguishing the lights which on that occasion were flung to the ground, she desired to manifest to them, how their faith had been destroyed by that separation which she so earnestly desired to terminate; because she desired to inculcate the lesson in the spirit which God himself infused into Jeremias when he broke the potter's vessel in the valley of Ennon; conscious that she had preserved with fidelity the deposit entrusted to her care, she could not desert her faith to embrace their opinions: and even would reason dictate, and should she so determine, a task of no small difficulty would remain; one that instantly creates an embarrassment from which they can afford no principle of extrication, would perplex her, that is, to find one amongst their conflicting associations which can assure us that in all things it teaches the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Which of them claims an exemption from error? Yet the doctrines of God, the faith of Jesus Christ cannot be contradictory, cannot be erroneous. The form is not now gone through, but unfortunately, the breach is not narrowed!

Many of the writers who have used this topic to excite the preju-

dices of Protestants against Catholics have asserted, that this bull was altogether a denunciation of them, followed by horrible imprecations and maledictions. This assertion is in both respects unfounded; because, in the first place, they who fix the origin of this custom at the latest date, attribute it to Martin V. in 1420, which is a full century before the date of Protestantism: but there is evidence of its existence previous to 1294, when Boniface VIII. became Pontiff. It was a solemn warning not only to those who erred in faith and destroyed the unity of the church, but also an admonition to those who troubled the public peace of nations or repose of society, that unless they repented and were reconciled to God they could have no hope of his blessing in this life, no participation in the sacramental institutions, nor any reasonable prospect of salvation in the next. This admonition which was certainly no imprecation or malediction, was published in those middle ages of the church, not only once, but three or four times in the year. The object sought to be obtained, was not the wrath of heaven upon the sinner; but that he should be converted and live. Another serious mistake is frequently made by several of our separated brethren who accuse our people of believing that the indulgence is obtained, not upon the condition of being reconciled to God, but by getting possession of one of those little printed notices, to obtain which the same anxiety exists, that will be everywhere found amongst the body of the people when papers are flung to them on public occasions. That there is a pious attachment to the very form itself, is an argument of the affection of the people for their faith; and if strangers, who have not always the most perfect knowledge of their language, their religion or habits, will endeavour from the expressions of these, to sustain their own preconceived opinions in contradiction to our testimony of our own doctrine, and the nature of our practices, we submit that it is not the best mode of obtaining accurate information, and that publications made under such impressions are not those which deserve the highest estimation. Persons in humble stations of life and of limited education can well understand doctrines and practices, though they cannot explain them with the accuracy of theologians.

The Washing of the Feet. The cardinals having changed their vestments and returned from the gallery, a few precede the Pope to the hall prepared for the ceremony of washing the feet. The holy father is carried in his chair in the same manner as he was taken to the gallery.

The custon of performing this ceremony is exceedingly ancient, and we can fix it upon no period since the days of the Apostles for its introduction. It was as widely spread through the church, as almost any

other practice with which we are acquainted, and the special rites were as various as the nations in which they were performed; but all agree in the selection of twelve, thirteen, or sometimes a greater number of persons whose feet were washed, by a prelate, a prince, or a monarch; and some alms were also given to those persons.

Before the introduction of stockings, the feet of travellers and others were generally soiled, and one of the first acts of kindness which was shown to a stranger or a guest, was the washing of his feet; if this was performed by his host, it was the greatest evidence of attention and respect, and the higher the dignity of him who performed it, the greater was the testimony of condescension on his part, and of honour to the stranger. The Saviour, desiring to teach those whom he told to learn of him, because he was meek and humble of heart, (*Matt.* xi. 29,) performed this office for his Apostles, telling them that they ought by doing so, imitate his example. It is true that what he seeks is not the mere outward action, but the interior disposition; however, our nature is such, that we are in general greatly impressed with the performance of the ceremony, and the great Author of our being was well aware of this, when he not merely sanctioned the use of the rite, but taught it. Hence St. Paul in his first epistle to Timothy, enumerating the qualities required in a widow to be consecrated to the service of the church mentions, (v. 10,) amongst others, "if she have washed the saints' feet." St. Augustin, as early as the beginning of the fifth age, in his epistle to Januarius, tells us that the custom had been laid aside by several churches, because it had given rise to an error, that it was a sort of baptism. This, however, was a partial and transient mistake, and the usage was resumed, especially on this anniversary day. The fathers of the seventeenth Council of Toledo in the seventeenth century complain greatly of its neglect and enact a penalty against such of the clergy as should omit it. Pope Zachary, about the year 742, having been consulted by St. Boniface, Bishop of Mayence, regarding the propriety of its performance in convents of females, answered that the nuns might certainly continue to perform this office for each other, as the admonition of Christ extended to women as it did to men.

Various abuses occasionally crept into this discipline as well as into others, and amongst them was that of an unbecoming luxury at feasts that were made at some monasteries: these however found their remedies in due time.

In Rome the custom was at one period to have two washings, one immediately after Mass, when the feet of twelve sub-deacons were washed, and one after dinner, when thirteen poor persons were similar-

ly attended: both were performed by the Pope. But for a long time it has been usual to have only one ablution, viz: that of thirteen priests. The selection of one of these was made by each of the following personages, viz.: by the ambassadors of Austria, of France, of Spain, of Portugal, of Venice, by the three cardinals, viz.: the Protector of Poland, the secretary of state and the Camerlengo: by the major-domo, and by the captain of the Swiss guard; the cardinal-prefect of Propaganda names two, and an Armenian priest is selected by the cardinal-protector of that nation. Antiquarians and rubricians have been perplexed to find why the number is thirteen. We shall give their conjectures, without venturing any opinion, as to which should be preferred. In John xii. 3, mention is made of Mary's having anointed the feet of the Saviour. The first washing the feet of the twelve sub-deacons was said to be in commemoration of this: the second washing of thirteen poor persons after dinner, was said to have been a representation of that described in *John* xii. 4, and so forth. The present ceremony represents both: one person for the act of Mary, and twelve for the Apostles. Others tell us that the thirteenth was introduced to commemorate the miraculous appearance of an angel, amongst twelve poor persons, whom St. Gregory the Great daily fed at his residence, now the church on the Monte Celio, in a chapel near which a picture is seen describing the occurrence, with the following distich.

Bissenos hic Gregorius pascabat egenos
Angelus et decimus tertius accubuit.

Whence a custom originated of having daily thirteen poor persons to dine at the Pope's palace, amongst whom are generally some priests sent from the hospital of the Trinity. Others say that the thirteenth represents St. Paul, others that he is for Matthias: whilst some will have him to represent the host at whose house Christ celebrated the festival with the Apostles, and who they say had his feet also washed on that occasion by the Saviour. The object of the ceremony then is two-fold: first, to preserve the recollection of interesting facts, by continuing ancient usages: and secondly to give the Pontiff this opportunity of learning and practising a lesson of humility taught by his divine Master.

The hall where this ceremony takes place is richly decorated; the *Sala Ducale*, opposite the Sistine chapel, was the chamber formerly used; latterly, the *Sala Clementina*, as being much larger, is preferred.

The Papal throne is fixed upon a platform at one end of the hall, and on each side is a stool for the assisting cardinal-deacon, near these the flabelli lie against the arras, which hangs on the wall.

To the right of the throne is the place for the prince-assistant and

the magistrates: such of the cardinal-bishops and priests as remain, are also on this side, and near them is the treasurer.

On the same side, but apart, are persons who hold basins of flowers, towels, and pitchers.

On the lower steps are three auditors of the Rota, two of whom are to bear the Pope's train, the third has a towel for wiping his hands: with them are two clerks of the chamber, to assist in that washing.

To the left of the throne are two assistant-bishops, to serve with the book and candle, attended by two clerks of the chapel, who hold these when not wanted. At this side also are the cardinal-deacons, and such cardinal-priests as could not conveniently find places on the other side.

Upon the lower step is the cardinal-deacon, who sings the Gospel, wearing a dalmatic, and having on his left an auditor of the Rota in a Tunic. The cross-bearers and acolyths are also near them, as also the attendants of the cardinal-deacon, with the book, and stand, and so forth.

The thurifer and incense-bearer are on the lower step also; and any prelates who may attend, take places as conveniently as they can upon the floor.

The priests whose feet are to be washed are seated on elevated benches, wearing white habits, and having on their heads high caps: hoods also come over their shoulders and around their necks. The stocking on the right foot of each is cut, to be easily opened and exhibit the foot bare.

When the holy father has left the gallery of the benediction, he changes his vestments, taking a purple stole, a cope of dark red satin, with a silver-gilt formal or breast-plate, and mitre of silver cloth. Being thus vested, he comes to the place prepared for him in the hall, and, sitting, he casts incense into the thurible, and gives the blessing to the cardinal-deacon who is to sing the gospel. The deacon chaunts it from the xxi. of *John*; the book is kissed, and the Pope incensed as usual; then the choir sings the versicle: *Mandatum novum do vobis*, and so forth.

The holy father rises, and the cope being removed by the assistant-deacon, a towel of fine cloth trimmed with lace, is tied on him, and attended by his master of ceremonies and deacons, he proceeds to the washing. A sub-deacon, in a white tunic, without a maniple, attends on the Pontiff's right hand, and raises the bared foot of each priest. The Pontiff kneels, and rubs the foot with water poured by an esquire into a silver gilt basin: after drying which, the holy father kisses it: a towel and nosegay are then handed by one of the deacons to each priest. The treasurer follows with a purse of crimson velvet

fringed with gold, and gives to each a medal of gold and also one of silver.

This ceremony exhibits to those who declaim against the holy father, for permitting the faithful to manifest their respect for the commission of the Saviour, with which he is invested, by sometimes kissing his foot, that he is equally disposed to pay the same respect to that same commission, though existing in an inferior degree in others: and not only to those who are thus honoured, but also to all others of his brethren, the fallen children of Adam, covered with those imperfections and weaknesses, which are equally the lot of him that wears the tiara, and of him who is the lowest amongst his brethren, in the most humble monastery of the church. Would to God that our friends would calmly and fully examine the spirit of our customs! It would be seen that it is by no means that of domination or pride; and we might perhaps be again one fold under one shepherd! (*John* x. 16.)

His holiness having returned to his seat, the towel is removed, and the assistant prince, kneeling, pours water on his hands; the first cardinal-priest presents the towel to dry them; the holy father resumes the cope, intones the *Pater noster*, and recites the concluding prayer, beseeching the Almighty not to despise or overlook the fallen race of men, which is yet the work of his own hands.

Should the Pope not be able to perform this ceremony, he requests of one of the senior cardinals to do it in his name, and, with a very few changes, the same form is gone through.

The Dinner. It is usual for the Pope to have dinner prepared on this day, in one of the halls of the palace, for the Apostoli, as these priests whose feet have been washed are called. His holiness, if his strength permits, attends to bless the table; and having an apron put on, pours water on their hands; serves them one or two dishes, which are handed to him from the sideboard by prelates, who kneel, on presenting them; then, having given each to drink, he bestows his blessing, and retires. Should the holy father not be able to attend, his place on this occasion is filled by the major-domo.

The Cardinal's Dinner. It has been generally customary to invite the sacred college on this day, to dine in another hall of the palace, the tables in which are splendidly decorated: the prince-assistant at the throne, as representative of the Roman nobility, is also invited with their eminences. This dinner was given for the convenience of those who resided at a distance; and another object was to bind this venerable body together on this day, in every way, in the closest affection and

friendship. After the dinner, it was usual to have a sermon delivered by one of the best orators who had preached in the city during Lent.

The Tenebræ. The matins and lauds for Friday are recited in the papal chapel; the altar exhibits the desolation of the Saviour's passion; the throne is uncovered, the benches despoiled of their tapestry, no canopy is over the altar-piece, which is covered with violet, and the candles are all of yellow wax. The *Miserere* is by Bai.

The cardinal grand penitentiary goes this evening in state to St. Peter's, where he is formally received by four cardinals, and goes to his confessional.

St. Peter's. Similar offices to those of the papal chapel are also performed in their choral chapel by the chapter of this basilic, where the Lamentations and *Miserere* are also deeply affecting. But they have a peculiar ceremony, which is

The Washing of the Altar. Various conjectures have been given by different writers, respecting the origin and object of this ceremony, which is by no means so common as the others that have been described. Some Dominican and Carmelite friars in their conventional sanctuaries, and some cathedral and other churches have occasionally practised the same rite.

When the canons have sung the *Benedictus in Lauds*, small brushes formed of box or yew, but more generally of bloodwort, are distributed to all the members of this chapel. After this, the six most ancient priests change their vesture, taking surplices and black stoles, the president wears besides these, a black cope: preceded by the veiled cross, having on each side an acolyth, with a candle extinguished, as a token of mourning, they go to the main altar, and kneeling there, they make a short secret prayer. The president, after this, intones the antiphon, "they divided my garments amongst them, and upon my vesture they cast lots." He then goes with his assistants to the altar, and strips it of the cloth, as the Saviour was stripped of his garments; whilst the president and those who assist him are occupied in this ceremony, the choir sings the *Psalm* xxi. "O God, my God, look upon me; why hast thou forsaken me?" which is so beautifully prophetic of the passion. After the altar has been stripped, wine and water are poured upon it, as emblematic of the blood in which the Saviour was bathed not only in the garden, in his sweat, but at the pillar and upon Calvary; as also of the blood and water that flowed from his side, when after his death it was pierced with the spear. The clergy and their assistants, suc-

cessively wash the altar with their brushes, gather up the liquid then with sponges, and dry it with towels prepared for the occasion; to all which, several writers extend their mystical explanation, as, for instance, that we should recollect how his body was cleansed, embalmed, and wrapped up in linen cloths, to be laid in the sepulchre.

The antiphon is repeated, after which the Lord's prayer and the ordinary prayer of the office of these days are added. Some of the relics connected with the passion are then exposed to the veneration of the faithful.

Formerly, a large illuminated cross was let down from the cupola, on this and the following evenings: but Pope Leo XII., in consequence of the irreverence and irregularities which took place in the church, ordered the discontinuance of this exhibition.

Good Friday. Has been particularly marked from the earliest period of Christianity as a day of mourning, and of solemn ritual observances: but these ceremonies were not always the same. Down to the third or fourth century, it was usually called the Pasch, the name by which Tertullian calls it, because then Christ our pasch was slain. Eusebius in his history (lib. ii., c. 17,) informs us that the Essenians, or Ascetics of Egypt, gave this time to watchings, sacred reading, fasts, and so forth.

Gregory of Tours states that the watchings in that place were kept in darkness, until the third hour of the night, when a small light appeared before the altar, (lib. i. chap. 5, *de gloria martyrum.*) In an old antiphonary of Tours, we are told that the hours were recited by the canons of St. Martin, not sitting in the stalls, but standing around a marble tomb. In other churches the altars were not washed until this day; at Chartres the one that had been thus cleansed, was then rubbed with fragrant herbs; this took place before the consuming of the sacrament; in Autun and other churches, it was after the consumption. In some places, as at Salisbury in England, they constructed a sepulchre, to which the crucifix was carried in procession, and the figure of the Saviour was laid, as in a state of repose, in the tomb; together with it they placed the ciborium with the Holy Eucharist. In Poitiers they placed the Holy Sacrament in a corporal, which being carefully folded, was enclosed between two patens, and a golden cross was laid on them; the whole was then carefully rolled up in clean linen, and laid in a sepulchre, together with holy water and incense; the door of this repository was locked, and five persons were left in charge of this deposit, and of the multitude of lights with which it was surrounded. The fourth

Council of Toledo, at the beginning of the seventh century, notices a great negligence of several Spanish churches, which were closed altogether on this and the following day. The sixteenth Council of Toledo mentions that no priest was permitted to celebrate Mass on either of those days. And the Gothic missal gives no office save that of the distribution of the passion through all the hours. Pope Innocent I., in his epistle to Decentius, about the year 410, states that there was no celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice on this day, nor upon the next, not only through grief for the Saviour's death, but in remembrance of the terror of the Apostles who concealed themselves. The reason of these several rites is easily understood.

On this day, the Papal chapel presents to the beholder lessons of grief and penance. The altar is stripped, the platform without a carpet, the benches uncovered, the throne naked; the candles are yellow. The cardinals come in purple stockings, collars, and stiff cappas; they wear no rings, the attendants have their maces reversed; no salute is paid either by the cardinal who enters the choir to those who have previously arrived, nor by his brethren when they see him enter. The bishops and other prelates lay aside their purple collars and stockings, and wear black, nor have they rings. The cardinal grand penitentiary, or whoever takes his place as celebrant, enters in black vestments, with his deacon and sub-deacon also in black. These latter wear chasubles folded in the front. This is a peculiarity belonging to times of penance, and also a remnant of ancient usage; when in the most remote antiquity, previous to the introduction of the dalmatic and tunics as the proper vesture of the deacon and sub-deacon, they wore the trabea, but rolled up at front to have their hands free and unencumbered. Neither lights nor incense are brought.

The Lessons and Passion. The Pope enters similarly habited as he was at the *Tenebræ*, save that he also has laid aside his ring. He gives no blessing, but goes to kneel in front of the altar. The celebrant kneels at his left. They pray in secret. Two masters of ceremony spread a single cloth upon the altar, the pontiff ascends his chair, where he sits to read, the celebrant goes to the altar, which he kisses—then to his seat, where he reads. A chaunter sings a lesson from the prophecy of Osee, in which the Lord invites his people to repentance and mercy, and promises to receive them to mercy, when they come with becoming dispositions. In it there is also an insinuation of the manner in which the Mosaic rites and sacrifices were valueless, except so far as they were connected with that of Christ. The counter trebles intone the tract,

which is followed up by the choir. It relates also to the passion. The prayer folows, after the old mode of invitation by the deacon, *Flectamus genua*; the sub-deacon then chaunts a lesson from the book of Exodus, describing the institution of the passover, which was a strikingly prophetic figure of the death of the Redeemer. Previous to reading it, the sub-deacon lays aside his chasuble according to the ancient custom, but resumes it when he has concluded. The tract is composed of several passages prophetic of the passion. Three chaunters then come habited as deacons, but without dalmatics, to sing the history of the sufferings of the Saviour, as recorded in the *Gospel of St. John*, who was the only evangelist that was present at the awful transactions, and therefore gave testimony of what he saw. Besides this, the histories given by the other three evangelists had been published on Sunday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. This passion is chaunted as that of St. Matthew was on Sunday,—but that, at the conclusion, the deacon sings without having asked a blessing, and without having lights or incense.

Previously to singing, he lays aside his chasuble, and takes a large overstole, which represents the manner in which formerly the chasuble, in times of penance, was worn by his predecessors in office. The book is not kissed, at the conclusion, by either the Pope or the celebrant.

Sermon. A Latin sermon is then preached by a minor conventual, who publishes the indulgence at its conclusion, as no confession is made by the deacon—nor does the holy father give a blessing.

Prayers for all Classes and Persons. This being the anniversary of the great day of expiation, when Christ laid down his life for all mankind, the church commands her ministers, at her altars, to beseech that he would be merciful to all. The form recited is exceedingly ancient. Intercession is made for all orders and degrees, for the whole church, for the holy father as its visible head, for all bishops, priests, deacons, and other clergymen—for confessors, virgins, widows, and all other congregated portions of the faithful—for temporal sovereigns—for catechumens: also, to beseech the removal of error, of disease, and famine, to intreat the liberation of captives, safe return of travellers, health of the sick, and secure arrival at their proper harbours to those who are tossed upon the ocean. In tones of supplication, the church prays for the grace of conversion and mercy to those who unfortunately stray in the labyrinths of heresy and schism, that, no longer deceived by the wiles of seduction, they may return to that tender mother from whom they have been so long estranged: for the Jew also, she presents her petition, that, on this day of mercy, that blood which his fathers desired

might be upon them and their children, might indeed come upon the descendants in streams of expiation, and not in rills of burning. But, as in mockery his fathers bent their knees before the Saviour, whom they derided as the shadow of the king, when the prayer is this day made, on his behalf, the deacon does not invite the assistants to kneel, nor does the like form of genuflection accompany this, as was joined to the other prayers. Extending her view to the poor pagans who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, she anxiously supplicates, that, leaving their idols, they too may be brought to serve, in spirit and in truth, the only true and living God, Jesus Christ, who on this day offered himself to be an oblation for their sins.

Grateful affection for the Saviour. These prayers being concluded, the moment has arrived for entering into the full contemplation of the catastrophe of Calvary. Made less than the angels, we are not pure spirits. Dwelling in houses of clay, our souls are principally affected through the organs of sense, liable to distraction; we need some sensible exhibition to make a deep impression on the mind. Paulinus, in ep. 31, ad Severum, informs us, that on this day, in Jerusalem, the bishop produced to the assembled multitude the cross on which the blessed Saviour died; upon that spot, with the very tree on which redemption was effected before them, what must have been the sensations of the race that was redeemed? When the relics of a family are displayed, how do hearts feel? How do tears flow? This is the token of affection given by one who sleeps upon a foreign shore! Here is the emblem of friendship left by another whose eye is closed in death! whose ear is filled with dust! Description would only profane the sacred feelings which are, on such occasions, cherished and indulged by every human breast. The God who formed us, implanted those feelings when he enlightened us with reason; properly regulated, they are not only congenial to that true philosophy which indeed loves wisdom and truth, but they admirably sustain it! And on what occasion could they be more properly and rationally indulged, than when, on this day, the church exhibits to us a commemorative emblem, to absorb our minds in the contemplation of the affectionate sacrifice made by the Son of God for miserable sinners! Can it be, that when we are penetrated with the vast importance to ourselves individually of this atonement, we shall be restrained, by the mockery of reason in the coldness of calculation, from approaching, with sorrow and gratitude blending into adoration, to the very foot of that emblem itself,—there to lift the mind to that heaven which contains Him, whilst here we kiss the symbol of that cross upon which he

bled! Forbid it every generous feeling! Forbid it every sentiment of pure religion! Can the adoration of the bleeding God be called idolatry? Can the ardent, the affectionate, the contrite, the penitent recollection of the mysteries of Calvary be irreligion? Can the manifestation of the feelings of our hearts, towards the emblem, where the great original, the beloved Jesus himself is removed beyond our reach, be superstition? But why dwell on such a topic? Nature and religion will be there our best vindication, to the calm, to the reflecting, to the unbiased, and to the candid. Others may be permitted the exhibition which they too often make in a manner which is equally unkind to the feelings of their brethren, as it is discreditable to their own.

Adoration of Christ Crucified. Veneration of the Cross. The celebrant, laying aside his chasuble, goes to the epistle side of the altar, towards its back, where he receives from the deacon a cruicfix covered with a black veil, and disclosing a portion of its summit, he chaunts, *Ecce lignum Crucis,* behold the wood of the cross! two tenor voices continue, *In quo salus mundi pependit,* upon which the salvation of the world hung. The choir answers, *Venite adoremus,* come let us adore; and all bend their knees: coming to the angle, in the front part of the same side, the celebrant uncovers the right arm, and in somewhat of a higher strain, the same passages are sung, and the same answer is repeated. Then going to the middle of the platform, in the front of the altar, the celebrant exhibits the entire figure, and in a higher tone repeats the phrases above mentioned, whilst he exposes the symbol of him who was in Judea gradually exhibited as the Redeemer, but lifted upon Calvary, was made manifest to the world as the victim of propitiation, by whose bruises we are healed. The celebrant then descends and places the crucifix upon a veil for veneration.

Formerly the clergy of most churches came with bare feet to the celebration of the offices of this day; and not only they, but most of the laity paid this tribute of homage to him who was for them stripped of every garment, and after multiplied injuries, was led through deriding crowds, to an infamous death. William of Chartres writes of St. Louis, King of France, that bare-footed, and covered with rough garments, his head and neck exposed, this monarch went from his seat on his knees, followed by his children, to the veneration of the cross, and the adoration of Him who suffered upon it. But previously to his coming into the church, the king had made a painful round: for about sunrise, in poor raiment, accompanied only by a few select attendants, he went bare-footed through the paved and muddy streets of the city, to the

several churches therein to pray, and giving considerable alms to the poor whom he met. St. Elizabeth, daughter to the king of Hungary, went in like manner, poorly habited and bare-footed, to the several churches of the city on this day, giving some offerings at the various altars and large alms to the poor. A great many other similar instances of dignified penitents might be quoted. In the East the custom was nearly universal: all who went in the procession were bare-footed: a very imperfect remnant of the custom still remains in the habit of laying aside the shoes at going to the salutation of the cross. The performance of this ceremony is called the adoration: in which, though the tokens of affectionate respect are given to the symbol, the homage of adoration is paid only to Christ, the incarnate and eternal Son of God. The Pope having risen from the third genuflection at the uncovering of the cross, sits until his shoes are taken off, and if he wishes, as he generally does, the cope also is laid aside. Coming down from his throne to the entrance of the choir, his mitre is there taken off, and he kneels to pay his homages, rising he advances to the middlle of the choir, where he repeats this token of respect, and again rising, goes to the foot of the cross, where he bows most profoundly, and an attendant knight, who holds his offering in a purse of red damask silk trimmed with gold, casts it into a silver basin which is on the steps. The choir meantime performs the passages of reproach, in which the mercies of God to the Jewish people, and their return of ingratitude in repaying the Saviour with so many ignominies is enumerated, and at the end of each reproach the τρισαγιον is sung in Latin and in Greek. Holy God! Holy Strong One! Holy Immortal! have mercy on us! ! ! The cardinals, two and two, follow the example of the holy father; they are followed by the bishops, and with the exception of the generals of religious orders, no others besides these take off their shoes. The other members of the chapel go to the veneration of the cross in the same order they went to receive the palm on Sunday: formerly this rite was performed in silence, but the custom of singing has been for a considerable time in use; though, indeed, this usage may be considered modern, as not being yet five hundred years old.

Procession to and from the Pauline Chapel. The ceremony of the adoration having terminated, the chaunters go into the *Sala Regia*, and take their places near the gate of the Pauline Chapel. The esquires lead the procession, which goes in silence from the Sistine; they are followed by the procurators-general, the private chaplains, the consistorial-advocates, the private chamberlains, the voters of the signature,

the clerks of the chamber, and the auditors of the Rota. The sub-deacon follows with the cross uncovered, between two acolyths with lighted candles: after them come the cardinals, followed by the celebrant; the Pope comes next; the prelates of the *fiocchetti*, that is, the governor, the auditor of the *camera*, the major-domo, and the treasurer. The prothonotaries precede the generals of the religious orders, who close this array.

Being arrived at the Pauline chapel, the esquires have their torches lighted. The Pope kneels to adore the Holy Sacrament. The sacristan receives the key which, on the preceding day, he had given to the cardinal grand penitentiary, and ascending to where the sacrament is kept, unlocks and opens the door. Meantime the holy father having cast incense into the thurible, perfumes the host. The sacristan takes the sacrament, and gives it to the cardinal, who, coming down, presents it to the sovereign Pontiff, upon whose shoulders a rich veil is placed, the extremities of which are brought over the sacred vessel which he holds; and the procession begins to return, the choirs singing in alternate verses the hymn, *Vexilla regis prodeunt*. The assistant bishops meet the Pope at the gate and sustain a canopy under which his holiness proceeds. Upon entering the Sistine chapel, the choir retire on either side of the chancel, until after the holy father has passed: as he enters the chapel, they take up the verse, *O Crux ave spes unica*. Every person kneels as he passes with the Holy Sacrament. Upon his arriving at the platform, he gives the vessel which contains it to the celebrant, who places it on the alter; the deacon removes the veil from the shoulders of his holiness: having put incense into the thurible and perfumed the sacred host, the Pope returns to his seat, where he again blesses incense for the use of the celebrant, and stands uncovered.

Mass of the pre-sanctified: The church, as has been previously observed, does not consecrate the eucharist on this day: but in order to show forth, in some manner, the death of the Lord upon the great anniversary of his atonement, a host consecrated on the previous day, and which had been reserved, is now brought to the altar to be there consumed. It has been consecrated previously, or pre-sanctified, hence the ceremony which now takes place has its name.

The sacrament having been taken from the chalice, is laid upon the altar, the deacon puts wine into the vessel, and the sub-deacon mingles water with it, not for the purpose of consecration, but of ablution: after having been covered with the pall, the celebrant incenses the offerings and the altar, in the usual manner; but at every time that he passes

before the Holy Sacrament or arrives where it is, he bends his knee, and when he washes his hands before the altar he faces rather towards the middle than the front, to avoid turning his back upon the Holy Eucharist. After a short prayer of humility, which he says bowing down before the altar, he turns to ask the prayers of his brethren by the *Orate fratres*: he then chaunts the Lord's prayer and its sequel, as in the ordinary Mass: at the termination of the prayers, he makes the proper reverence to the Holy Sacrament, then holding it over the paten, elevates it with one hand, during which the Pope and attendants kneel: after this he divides it in the usual manner, putting one particle in the chalice; and makes his preparation by saying the last of the usual prayers before communion: then striking his breast and repeating the *Domine non sum dignus*, he takes the Holy Sacrament, afterwards the chalice with its contents. All rise from their knees, the lights are extinguished: the holy father, being mitred, returns to his seat, and he and the attendants sit. The celebrant takes an ablution from the chalice, which is then purified; he washes his fingers at the corner of the epistle, says a short prayer of thanksgiving, and departs.

Vespers: The vespers are said in choir: they consist of five *Psalms* and their antiphons: the canticle *Magnificat*, of the blessed Virgin, as in St. Luke, from c. i., 46 to 56, with its antiphon the *Psalm* l. *Miserere*, and the usual prayer.

The Dinner: When the cardinals dine at the Papal palace on this day, the preparation and fare are far more simple than those for Thursday; and the preacher who delivers the sermon does not declaim from the pulpit, but seated on an ordinary chair on the floor.

The Tenebræ: The matins and lauds for Saturday are said in the evening. The third lesson of the first nocturn is the prayer of the prophet Jeremias, those of the second nocturn are a portion of the commentary of St. Augustin on the *Psalm* lxiii., those of the third nocturn are the admirable passages of the epistle to the Hebrews, commencing at ix. 11, and continuing to the end of verse 22. The antiphons, responsories, and indeed the whole office, now regard the burial and repose of the Saviour. The sentiments which the church wishes to inspire, are those of hope mingled with the grief and contrition which, she trusts, have been previously excited.

The Relics: Among the relics kept in the church of St. Peter, are three very remarkable objects. The veneration in which they should

be held would be questioned by few, if their authenticity were sufficiently established. The conclusion to which each individual will arrive after a calm and deliberate examination, is to be for him the rule to guide his devotion to each especial case of this description. Some ecclesiastical tribunals have been from time to time established and remodelled for the purpose of examining the testimony, reporting their opinions, and giving to the holy father the best aid that jealous scrutiny, and scientific research could afford, so that he might be enabled to give to his children some rules of enlightened piety in regard to special relics. It has been fashionable to decry indiscriminately every devotional practice of this description, and to cast ridicule upon the several observances of the church respecting relics. It has been often loudly proclaimed that the acts of the clergy were but combinations of fraud and folly, and frequently strangers, who never examined the grounds of our practice, were the first to condemn and the most unsparing in their vituperation. Is this rational?

Far be it from any Catholic to insinuate that the testimony of even the sovereign Pontiff, respecting the authenticity of relics, is of equal authority with the records of the Gospel; or that devotion to any special object of this description, is a necessary part of religion! But notwithstanding all that has been said and written upon the subject, by the enemies of this devotion, we must say, that in almost every instance, which came under our view, there was a sad mistake regarding principle, and gross error respecting facts. It must be admitted that occasionally, some few instances of superstition might possibly occur; but what good custom can be found without its accompanying abuse? Men have profaned the sacraments, and have turned the most venerable and simple acts of religion to the very worst purposes; and every well-regulated mind instantly admits, that in the whole category of sophisms, a more despicable one cannot be found, than that which could conclude against use, because of abuse. Our principle regarding sacred relics, is, that in religion they are to be held in a veneration, corresponding to that in which tokens of affection, and memorials of endearment, are preserved in well-regulated and virtuous families. How often is some delicious feeling indulged apart from the intrusion of the stranger, regarding that which to him would appear a trifle? A ring, a book, even a lock from that head which in life was so dear, but now lies in death! No! Words cannot express what the soul indulges! Had you the garment which the Saviour wore! Had you the seat on which he rested, when fatigued from his journey, he conversed with the woman of Samaria! How many persons have, during centuries, gone to visit those

spots endeared by so many scriptural recollections, by so many divine associations! "How many," said St. John Chrysostom, fourteen hundred years ago, "how many persons say, I should wish to see his face, his clothes, his figure. I should wish to touch him." The same voice of nature speaks this day to the soul of the European in its soft and secret whispers that then did to the spirit of the Asiatic. Yes! these very inanimate objects, these sensible associations bind us by some powerful but inexplicable spell to their great original. Intrinsically, in themselves, they are valueless; but because of this association and its effects, they are to us of inestimable value! Reason assents to the testimony of experience. Our feelings lead, whilst they elevate us. Our reason is useful to check aberrations; but it is quite as unable to penetrate to the source of this inestimable influence, as it is to discover the principle of our sensations themselves. This sentimental piety, properly regulated, is genuine devotion. And surely devotion, which at all times becomes a Christian, is peculiarly appropriate on the anniversary of his redemption.

It is not required that the mind shall give the same full and unhesitating assent to the authenticity of relics, as to an article of faith. In this latter case, God has clearly revealed, and man is consequently bound to believe; in the former, there is no similar evidence, no similar obligation, though there might be even some occasional supernal manifestation, or most respectable evidence of human testimony. But even when only high probability exists, devotion might be thereby created, and all the great religious advantages which are sought, will then arise.

On this evening, the Pope and cardinals, laying aside cope and cappa, come in procession from the Sistine chapel to St. Peter's, and several canons exhibit from the balcony, over the image of St. Veronica, three remarkable relics, which are in like manner exposed several times during these days.

They are believed to be, a portion of the cross on which the Saviour died, the blade of the lance with which his side was opened, and the figure of his face, impressed upon a cloth applied to it for the purpose of pious attention, by one of the daughters of Sion, when he laboured on his painful way to Calvary.

The examination of the critic might be fairly applied, in discussing the evidence upon which their authenticity rests. Neither the nature of this work nor the opportunities of its compiler, nor his occupations permit him now to develope it to the reader. He will merely say, that no tribunal that he ever knew, is more careful in the sifting of testimony, more scrupulous in the admission of documents, more rigid in

their close construction, and more cautious in confining all its conclusions strictly within their premises, than that which has examined respecting these relics, and permits their exposition: yet it does not positively assert the absolute authenticity of each. Respecting two of them, that of the cross and of the lance, scarcely the shadow of a doubt can exist. In regard to the other, there certainly is most unquestionable evidence to show, that during upwards of eleven hundred years it has been so carefully preserved, that no reasonable question can be entertained but that it is identically the same, which, at the remote period of the year 707, was then for a time undefined, but believed to be from the days of the Apostles, held in veneration as what it is still described to be. Should these relics exist anywhere, it is most natural to expect, that whatever other region might in the first instance possess them, they would in the process of time be brought to the capital of the Christian world. And if it be suspected that on one side there exists a predisposition to admit the authenticity, there can be no doubt, but that on the other side, there is too often found a determination to reject and to condemn every proof, that the Christian has preserved any memorial of his fathers in the faith, or any relic of the great Founder of his religion. Is it not strange that this disposition manifests itself strongly in the very persons who will hang with delight over the remnant of a bath, and undergo a pilgrimage to view the prison of a conspirator, to contemplate a robber's den, or stand upon some spot where, centuries before the Saviour lay in the crib of Bethlehem, a warrior fought or an orator declaimed? And if the rust of ages have not consumed the metals which, buried in the earth, are every day dug up, with the evidence of their antiquity, if coins, and medals, and implements of an era more remote than the origin of our religion, are admitted and preserved as genuine, why shall not the same principle equally apply to the relics of that religion itself? No reasonable ground can be admitted for making any distinction where the evidence is similar.

The portions of the cross which form the relic thus exhibited, had previously to the year 1620, been kept for a long period in Rome, at the churches of St. Anastasia, and that of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem. In this year they were by Pope Urban VIII. enclosed in a rich silver reliquary finely ornamented with lapis lazuli and chrystal, and placed in the keeping of the canons of St. Peter's. Some of the pieces had then been in this city, during thirteen centuries. The history of the discovery of the cross itself at Jerusalem, by St. Helena, the mother of the Emperor Constantine, a British lady, together with the various circumstances attending that discovery, may be seen in the works of St.

Ambrose, Ruffnus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, St. Paulinus of Nola, Sulpicius, Severus, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and others.

It is true that Basnage, Spanheim, and some such gentlemen, who lived twelve or thirteen centuries later than the above writers, undertake to assure us that it was all a fabrication or a mistake.

A considerable piece of the cross thus found, was sent to the Holy See, but the principal part was placed in a massy silver case, and kept in Jerusalem. No doubt can possibly be raised respecting the carrying away of that portion from Jerusalem, in the same case in which it was placed by St. Helena after its discovery. It was taken by Chosroas, king of Persia, when ravaging Palestine in his war against Phocas and his successor Heraclius, when Jerusalem was sacked in the year 624, and was borne to Ctesiphon, a city on the river Tigris. Zachary, the patriarch, was also with many others made a captive. Heraclius, having pushed the war with vigour, became conquerer in turn, and amongst the conditions upon which he gave peace to Siroes, the son and successor of Chosroas, one stipulated for the restoration of the cross, and the liberation of Zachary, by whom the cross itself was brought to Jerusalem, upon his return in 628. The history of the vain efforts of Heraclius, to carry it through the gate that led to Calvary, until he changed his vesture, is well known. Subsequently, this portion was taken to Constantinople, and placed in the great church of St. Sophia, where it was exposed to public veneration in the holy week. On Thursday, the emperor, the senate, the magistracy, and the men paid their devotions; on Friday, the empress, the widows, the virgins and the other females: and on Saturday, the bishops, the priests and the clergy of other orders. At various times, but especially during the crusades, portions of it were brought to the West, and some of the most remarkable pieces which had been preserved in this sacred city, were also exhibited to the faithful; a large portion which had been brought or sent by St. Helena herself, immediately after the discovery, was kept in the church of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, near the palace of the Lateran; and about the year 690, Pope Sergius I., had a large piece of it which had been kept in a silver case at the church of St. Peter, exhibited yearly in the church of St. John of Lateran, on the feast of the exaltation of the holy cross.

St. Helena also found the lance at Jerusalem, where it was kept with great care and respect. Amongst others who mention this in after times, are Venerable Bede and Gregory of Tours. Towards the close of the sixth century, it was carried to Constantinople, as is related in the Alexandrian Chronicle, and also proved by Du Cange in his notes upon Anna Comnena. At first it was kept in the church of St. Sophia, but subse-

quently it was divided; the top of the blade was taken to the imperial palace, and the shaft and remainder of the blade placed in the church of St. John of the Rock. This statement is sustained by a great number of documents. Anna Comnena shows, that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, this relic was, with others, held in great esteem in that city. In the thirteenth century, the Frank emperors who held Constantinople, being in great want of money, borrowed a considerable sum from the Venetians, and amongst other pledges given for repayment, was the point of the lance and other relics which were kept in the palace. Baldwin II., having passed his rights of recovery to St. Louis of France; this latter (as many public documents and credible writers, amongst whom are Du Cange, Matthew Paris, William of Nanges, Du Chesne, inform us) repaid the Venetians and took the relics to Paris. The remaining iron of the lance, was still kept in the monastic church of St. John de Petra, in Constantinople, in 1422; as several writers show, some of whom, as Bondelmont, had seen it.

About thirty-five years afterwards, Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, and Mahomet II. carefully preserved all the Christian relics. In 1489, one of his sons, who had been defeated by his brother Bajazet, took refuge in Rome. In 1492, Bajazet, desirous to conciliate the pontiff, sent to him an ambassador with that portion of the lance which had been kept in Constantinople. Innocent VIII. deputed two bishops to receive the relic, at Ancona; they were met upon their return at Narni, by two cardinals, who delivered the lance to his holiness, in the church of St. Mary del Popolo, at the Flaminian Gate, on the 31st of May, in that year; thence it was conveyed in procession to the Vatican.

The ambassador upon the delivery of the relic to his holiness, declared that this was the spear, the remaining portion of which was in the possession of the King of France; and in the middle of the last century, Lambertini, then a canon of St. Peter, afterwards Pope Benedict XIV., procured an exact model of the piece in France, which he declares in his work (*de Canoniz*, lib. iv., p. ii., ch. xxxi., n. 14), upon comparison with that received by Innocent VIII., and kept in St. Peter's, was found exactly to suit it.

The third relic is the figure of the Saviour's face on the towel. The evidence in this case should of course be more extensive than in either of the former, because it is not only necessary to prove the identity of the relic, but also the truth of the transaction, whereas the facts of the crucifixion, and of the opening of the side with the spear, are on all hands admitted to be notorious. The history in this case seems to be

complete, and to some of the best critics the truth of the occurrence and the identity of the towel, appear to have been unquestionably established, and are generally admitted.

In the church of St. Praxedes, at this time, a column is also shown, which is said to be that at which the Saviour was scourged. The column itself was well known in Jerusalem, and is mentioned by St. Jerome in the beginning of the fifth century. Ep. 108. That which is now in the church, whether the entire or only a portion of that which St. Jerome mentions, is uncertain, was brought from Jerusalem in the year 1223, by John Cardinal Colonna, in the time of Pope Honorius III., and its identity appears to be fully sustained.

Saturday before Easter: The ceremonies of this day are less solemn in the papal chapel, than those in the church of St. John of Lateran; because in the latter, besides the usual rite, the sacrament of baptism is administered, and an ordination takes place. But as it was quite impossible within the short time that circumstances allowed for this compilation, to treat of those subjects as they deserve; and as the bulk of the work would be so greatly increased, that it could not be printed in sufficient time, it was thought better to confine the explanation for this day, to what takes place in the Sixtine chapel, which, as far as it goes, will also answer for other places.

Blessing of the Fire and Incense: The ancient custom was, to spend the morning of this day in the last examination of the catechumens, who were preparing for baptism; and those found competent, received the final instructions, at intervals before evening. Towards sunset, preparations were made for then beginning the office, which lasted until midnight: previously to its termination, baptism and confirmation were administered; then Mass was celebrated, communion was given, and the faithful either remained through the night, or returned home to take some refection and rest, and to prepare for coming back at an early hour in the morning. Hence all the offices refer to night, and terminate with evidences of the resurrection, which took place at a very early hour, towards day-light of Sunday. The custom of having the offices early in the day, is but a departure, within six or seven hundred years, from the ancient and more strict discipline.

The lights having been all extinguished, it became necessary to procure the means of again illuminating the place, which had been thus left in desolation. The mode of procuring it was not everywhere the same. In some churches where they had not extinguished the upper

candle, this was kept for the purpose of renewing the other lights, in others they kept three large lamps concealed, as emblematic of the three days that the Saviour's body lay in the sepulchre, and they renewed the others from these, as significant of the resurrection. Where all the lights had been extinguished, they in a few places had recourse to ordinary fire, but in others they either produced it by means of a burning-glass, from the sun, or struck it from a flint; as signifying in the first place, the orient on high; in the second the rock, according to that of St. Paul. (*I Cor.* x. 4.) Where this extinction took place on each evening, they generally produced this new fire on each succeeding day, and as it was usual to sanctify every creature by the word of God, and by prayer, a blessing was pronounced over it. In Florence the fire is struck from flints brought from the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, in the time of the crusades.

The Roman church was one of the last to adopt this ceremony of a special blessing for Saturday. In 750, Pope Zachary, writing to Boniface, Bishop of Mayence, mentions the custom in Rome of having the three lamps, but assures him that the Romans knew nothing of the practice which elsewhere existed, of using burning glasses; but in the first Roman order, the custom of striking the fire from flint, is mentioned for Thursday, when there was a blessing for the fire. There are, however, abundant evidences of the ceremony having been in use long previous to this, on Saturday, in other churches. Leo. IV., a century later, mentions the custom then established in Rome, of producing fire from a flint on Saturday and blessing it. Then all the old fires were extinguished, and new ones were kindled from this, to signify the resurrection of Christ from the grave, and to exhibit the progress through the world, of that fire which he came to cast on the earth. (*Matt.* xii. 49.) At present in the papal chapel, this is done in the vestry room at an early hour: in most other churches, it is done in the porch. Five grains of incense are also blessed for the purpose of being put into the paschal candle. The acolyth then takes some coals of the fire that has been blessed, and puts them into the censer, upon which holy water is sprinkled, and the celebrant casts incense upon the coals with the usual blessing.

The New Light: The remaining part of the ceremony takes place in the chapel, whither the cardinals come in cappas of purple silk, but the attendant who precedes them has his mace reversed. During the previous benedictions the celebrant wore a purple cope. He prepares for the ceremony in the chapel by laying that aside and wearing violet

vestments for Mass. The deacon who is to bless the paschal candle, wears a white stole, with a maniple and dalmatic of the same colour; the sub-deacon, however, continues to wear his violet chasuble folded in front.

The cardinal celebrant comes thus attended to his usual seat in the chapel, then puts incense into the censer, and blesses it in the ordinary way; after which his attendants go to the Pauline chapel to bring the light, incense, and so forth. On their return, two mace-bearers precede; they are followed by an acolyth, with the five grains of blessed incense on a plate or salver; on his left is another with the censer; then the sub-deacon with the cross; the deacon follows with a long rod, on the top of which are three tapers parting from a common stock; on his left is a master of ceremonies with a candle lighted at the new fire; after these are two other acolyths.

Though it is impossible by any sensible exhibition to express mere insensible objects, yet those means might be well used as helps to bring us rather to the contemplation, than to the knowledge of spiritual things. The great body of mankind, for whose instruction the ceremonials of religion should be chiefly fitted, have more need of these aids, than have the well-informed and the contemplative. The impression made by a sensible exhibition remains doubly permanent, by reason of the hold which it takes upon the imagination as well as the memory, and the lesson which it is calculated to teach cannot be easily lost, when it has been once acquired. This is the great object of the church in her ritual services. She now desires to inform us that the light which the revelation of the Saviour gave to the world, has made us more fully and more clearly acquainted with the great mystery of the triune God, than were the patriarchs or even generally the prophets who existed before that period, when after having triumphed over death, he during forty days conversed with his Apostles concerning the church which they were to establish; (*Acts* i. 3,) and enabled them to understand many things that before they could not bear. (*John* xxvi. 12.) The nature of the Godhead is but one, yet it is whole and entire in each person of the blessed Trinity; and this was then clearly taught to them by the blessed Jesus.

Being arrived at the door of the railing, the master of ceremonies lights one of the tapers, upon elevating which the deacon sings, *Lumen Christi*, the light of Christ. All except the sub-deacon who carries the cross, bend their knees at the sacred name, to pay homage to him who reigns over the heavens and the earth. The choir answers *Deo gratias*, "Thanks be to God." At a station more advanced, the second taper is lighted, as was the above, and, at the foot of the throne, the third is

lighted, and with the like ceremony; but at each time the deacon sings upon a higher key. The third being lighted, he gives the rod to an acolyth, and taking the book which contains the proper canticle, he prepares for the

Blessing of the Paschal Candle: This candle is very large and formed of wax. The ceremony of its introduction is most ancient. Pope Zozimus, who came to the papal chair in 417, extended to all the parish churches the faculty of performing, in this instance, the ceremony that had been previously confined to the basilics; subsequently it has been extended to other churches. The appearance of this candle, is that of a large pillar, which by mystic writers is first assimilated to the cloud, but when lighted to the pillar of fire that guided the Hebrew people in the desert on their journey to the land of promise. It represents the true leader of the Christian host through this land of their pilgrimage to that country which the Lord promised as the recompense for their faithful observance of his law. It also is an exceedingly appropriate emblem of the manner in which the catechumens coming out of the land of darkness, and from under the thraldom of sin are thereby led through the waters of baptism to that place, where, during their journey to the heavenly regions which they seek, they shall be fed with the sacramental manna of the eucharist. It as yet exhibits Him as extinguished in the tomb, but it will speedily show Him forth as returned to life, and enlightening with knowledge those in whom He kindles hope, and whom He warms into the ardour of devotion.

The deacon having received the blessing which he besought from the celebrant, after having had the incense blessed, goes to a desk where he places the book, which he thrice incenses. On his right are the subdeacon with the cross, and an acolyth with the thurible; on his left are two acolyths, one of whom holds the rod with the lighted taper, the other has the blessed grains of incense. All now rise whilst the deacon sings the beautiful canticle *Exultet*, generally supposed to have been written by St. Augustin; some, however, attribute it to St. Ambrose, some to St. Leo, and others to Peter the deacon. The fourth Council of Toledo informs us (chapter viii.) that this ceremony is now a symbol of the reanimation of the body of Jesus, and five holes made in the candle, in the figure of a cross, represents the five principal wounds inflicted on our Victim.

The blessings of the church are usually performed by a priest or bishop; but this is one of the few which is given by a deacon; but for a sufficient reason. He is vested in white as the angel announcing the

resurrection, whilst the others, by their violet, still show the grief and dread of the Apostles and disciples. St. Augustin reminds us (Sermon 232, alias 144 *de Tempore*,) of the fact, that the resurrection was announced by an angel to the pious women, who conveyed the tidings to the Apostles; that as by a female the human race fell, so through the Virgin redemption came; and as by females the resurrection was made known, thus it is a lower minister of the church, who takes the place of these personages, by announcing the fact to the superior orders of the hierarchy, in the blessing of this candle. And as it was not the Apostles, but the disciples, that embalmed the body, (*John* xix. 40,) so this lesser minister as their representative, places the five grains of incense as an embalming in the holes which represent the wounds. At the proper time during the canticle, he lights the candle, which thus burns at the principle public offices, until the festival of the ascension; to show how Christ remained conversing with his Apostles and disciples, extending their knowledge whilst he cheered them with his countenance, until on that day on which the Gospel proclaims his ascent, it is extinguished. Soon after the lighting of the candle, the lamps of the church are also kindled.

There was an old custom in some churches, of which Bede among others inform us, of inscribing on this waxen column the date of the year from the resurrection, which he says, (*de temporum ratione*, c. 45,) some of his brethren saw in Rome at Christmas, the year DCLXVIII., to which adding the Saviour's age of 33, would give us the year 701. Martene furnishes several of those inscriptions, which exhibit a perfect calendar of the movable feasts and other dates. Afterwards, a long label, on which they were inscribed, was attached to the candle, and when printing was introduced, our directories, or church almanacs were substituted therefor.

The Prophecies, and so forth: Formerly, when several catechumens were to be baptized on this day, the clergy, having examined them, spent the time that was not otherwise occupied, in giving them instruction; and not only after, but before lighting the paschal candle, many portions of the Scriptures were read for this purpose. Prayers, having generally special reference to the catechumens, were said from time to time also, throughout the day; but when the number to be baptized was reduced to a very few, and the time for performing the office was changed to the morning, the custom began in Rome of having ordinations on this day. The number of lessons, which are called prophecies, because they are chiefly taken from the prophetic books, was fixed at twelve, and

were all postponed until after the paschal candle was blessed; the prayers were retained with the usual form of *flectamus genua*, except before the last, and tracts were sung after the fourth, the eighth, and the eleventh. In some places, the number of lessons was greater, in others, there were not so many.

The deacon lays aside his white vestment, and takes violet, and being seated, he reads the prophecies, whilst they are chaunted by choristers succeeding each other in the middle of the chapel; at the termination of each, the celebrant rising, and turning to the altar, sings *Oremus*; the deacon *Flectamus genua*; and the sub-deacon, *Levate*, after which, he sings the prayer. The tracts are also sung at the proper times. Formerly the lessons were sung in Greek as well as in Latin. This custom had been long discontinued, until the time of Benedict XIII., [more] than a century since; however his successors have not followed up the practice.

In churches where there are baptismal fonts, they immediately after the prophecies had been read, proceeded to bless the water for the great regenerating sacrament; after which such persons as were in readiness, whether adults or infants, were baptized. This is, of course, omitted in the papal chapel, and the litanies of the saints, which in the other churches are said after the baptism, are immediately sung.

The Litanies and Changes: Taking off his chasuble, the celebrant and his assistants prostrate themselves before the altar, whilst an invocation to the saints, and appeals to the Almighty God for his mercy, are made. At the petition *Peccatores te rogamus audi nos*: "We sinners do beseech thee to hear us:" the deacon and the sub-deacon retire with the assistant priest. They return to the chapel in white vestments, and the celebrant rising goes to the place where his corresponding robes lie, he puts off the violet and takes those befitting the paschal time.

The candles upon the altar, and upon the balustrade are now lighted. The Pope's chair is stripped of its penitential drapery; the violet is removed from the front of the altar. The cardinals, too, put off their violet cappas and take the red; for now the church begins to commemorate the resurrection. If Neophytes were present, their candles also would be lighted at this time.

The Mass: The Pope, who seldom makes his appearance in the chapel until this moment, now enters wearing a white cope and mitre; proceeding to the foot of the altar, he makes the usual commencement of the Mass. But there is no introit, because all have been for a long period present, and as the old usage was to sing this piece at the entrance,

it is of course omitted; since this night, no entrance was at this time made. The Pope being again mitred ascends to his throne, and the celebrant goes to the altar, whilst the choir performs the *Kyrie eleison.* The cardinals pay their homage to his holiness. As soon as the first cardinal-priest has done so, he has the incense blessed, which is then taken to the celebrant, and the usual incensing is gone through. As soon as the *Kyrie eleison* is finished, the celebrant intones the *Gloria in excelsis.* The veil is now removed from before the altar-piece, which represents the resurrection; the trumpets in the hall salute, the bells are again heard, and the guns of the castle of St. Angelo proclaim the festival.

After the epistle has been sung, another sub-deacon, accompanied by a master of ceremonies, kneels at the foot of the throne, and rising addresses the Pope, *Pater sancte, annuntio vobis guadium magnum, quod est, Alleluia.* "Holy father, I announce to you great joy, that is, Alleluiah." After which he retires. The tract, however, is blended with the gradual, because though Christ has arisen, he has not yet manifested himself; for the same reason, no lights are carried at the singing of the Gospel; nor is the creed said because the rite of this day is more ancient than the period of its introduction; and also to show that the faith was not yet fully established.

On this night, the offerings were made before the baptism, and of course long before the Mass commenced, and on that account, as well as because of the antiquity of the special ceremonial, no offering is said or sung. Another reason has been added, viz., to signify the silence of the holy women going to the sepulchre. The trumpets again sound at the consecration; but no *Agnus Dei,* and so forth, is said. This appeal to the Lamb of God was introduced by Pope Sergius about the year 700, and the form of this special liturgy is much more ancient; the same mystic reason, viz., to signify the silence of the holy women, is also given for this, by some writers. No *pax* or kiss of peace is given, because Christ had not as yet appeared to his disciples, giving them the salutation of peace, (*John* xx. 19.) Another reason is also given, viz., that this Mass being celebrated at night, as it were to conclude the baptismal rite, and to have holy communion given to those who had been, after their initiation, confirmed, the great celebration of the festival was postponed until morning, when coming early to the church, the faithful kissed each other, with a new salutation, *Christ has arisen.*

Vespers: After the celebrant has communicated, and taken the ablutions, vespers are chaunted in a very short formulary. The psalm

cxvi. with the doxology and the antiphon of three alleluias; after which the *Magnificat* with its proper antiphon is sung, whilst the altar is incensed, as are also those who assist. The celebrant, after the usual salutation, sings the prayer, after which he repeats the *Dominus vobiscum*, and the deacon adds two alleluias to his *Ite missa est*. The pontiff gives the usual blessing, and the celebrant publishes the usual indulgence, and the cardinals and others retire.

CEREMONIES OF EASTER SUNDAY

The Pope celebrates high Mass this day, with great solemnity, in the church of St. Peter. There are only three festivals through the year on which this is performed, viz.: Easter Sunday, the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, and Christmas day. Strangers who desire to understand what is done, should endeavour to become well acquainted with the nature and objects of the ceremonials belonging to the usual high Mass, as explained in the first part of this little compilation; otherwise the remarks which follow will be of very little use, as they are intended merely to supply what is special in this day's celebration. It will also be necessary for them to review the description, given in the beginning of this part, of the several attendants, their duties, offices, and places, if they would understand the procession and attendance.

The cardinals and prelates as well as the other members of the chapel are accustomed to assemble on this morning at half-past eight o'clock in the *Sala Ducale* and *Sala Regia*, there to form the procession which accompanies his holiness to the church. The line of its movement is from the royal hall or *Sala Regia* down the royal staircase, *Scala Regia*; from the statue of the Emperor Constantine it turns to the right, into the porch of the church: upon entering the porch of St. Peter's, or if the holy father only comes from the chapel of the Pieta, upon entering the church, the entire chapter ranged in two lines, receives this procession, which passes through their centre. On the right hand, are the cardinal arch-priest, with his vicar and all the canons; on the left are the beneficiaries, the Innocentine chaplains and beneficed clerks all in their choral robes. As soon as the Pope appears, the choristers intone, *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*, and so forth. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and so forth." The large bells add their chime to the scriptural salutation, and the military bands stationed in the portico swell the notes of gratulation to the two hundred and fifty-seventh successor of that Apostle, to whom the Sav-

iour of the world first made this declaration! Eighteen centuries have passed away since the supreme apostolic commission was bestowed; that commission shall continue in full force, until the world itself shall be destroyed. The events of the days gone by, are the exhibition of what may be expected in the days to come. In the midst of convulsions and ruin; in the palace, or in the prison, amidst the wreck and renovation of human institutions, everything around changing, yet itself unchanged, this rock, placed by the eternal hand, shall continue, as the foundation of the Christian edifice.

In the church, the grenadiers, the national troops, and capitoline guards are drawn up in opposed files, between which the entire array proceeds towards the altar.

When the holy father arrives opposite the chapel of the Holy Sacrament, the cortege halts, he descends from his chair, and the second cardinal-deacon takes off his tiara: his holiness kneels at a stool covered with crimson velvet and gold, to adore the sacred host which is exposed: the cardinals also kneel at benches covered with tapestry. After a short prayer the Pope goes to his chair, the first cardinal-deacon puts the tiara on his head, and he is borne to the foot of the altar, where he again comes down, and kneels to pray for a moment, before he goes to the throne that is placed on the epistle side of the choir: there he receives the homage of the cardinals, patriarchs, arch-bishops, bishops, mitred abbots, and penitentiaries.

Before proceeding farther, it may be well to give in this place a few explanations respecting objects and circumstances that for the first time come fully under our view.

The *tiara*, or triple crown, is not, properly speaking, so much an ecclesiastical as it is a royal ornament; it is supposed to have been first worn only with a single coronet, by Pope Sylvester, in the time of the Emperor Constantine. Innocent III., about the year 1200, writes, that the church gave to himself a crown for the temporal dominion and a mitre for the priesthood. It is generally thought that Boniface VIII., about the year 1300, was the first who added a second coronet to show the spiritual supremacy and the temporal power united; and about twenty years afterwards, John XXII., or according to others, Urban V., more than sixty years later, placed the third coronet upon it, thus making a tiara to exhibit the pontifical, the imperial, and the royal authority combined. To the wearer and to the beholder instructive lessons are taught, the one and the other are admonished that the head upon which it is borne is supposed to be endowed with proper science as it certainly possesses power of government, and spiritual jurisdiction; and the

variety of its knowledge should emulate the beauty of that decoration which is externally shown.

The large fans or *flabelli*, are now preserved not merely for ornament; but as memorials of ancient usage, and they have also their mystic meaning. The apostolic canon xix. directs that at Mass, a deacon at each side of the altar shall use a fan, or brush of peacock's feathers, to keep the place free from insects. Hildebert, bishop of Tours, when he sent one to a friend, remarks upon its mystic meaning (in ep. 7. alias 8.) where he advises, that as the annoyance of these insects was thereby prevented, so he that used it, should endeavour to banish the distractions of idle thoughts from the mind of him who approached to offer the holy sacrifice. The eyes in the peacock's feathers of which it is formed, admonish the pontiff that a general observation is fixed upon him, and show the necessity of circumspection in his own conduct. The Greeks call it ιρπιδιον, and give it to the deacon with a suitable admonition at his ordination. It is also mentioned in the liturgies of St. Basil, of St. John Chrysostom, and in several other Greek and Syriac documents. In the West we find it noticed in the constitutions of Cluny as well as in several ceremonials. In the life of St. Nicetas in Surius we find St. Athanasius, whilst he was a deacon, employed in using it. In the East, they formed the fans in many places like the winged seraphim, and used to add several other mystic lessons to those here touched upon.

The cross was in ancient times carried before the Pope, when he went to the stations of the city, to celebrate at the several churches: that now carried is called the *vexillum*. As the *labarum* was carried before the emperor, so is this carried before the pontiff, who should glory only in the cross, and always have Christ crucified before his eyes; for this purpose, the figure is turned towards him; as also to signify that the same Saviour who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against that church, which He should build upon Peter, regards him in His providence, and will keep His promise; for though a woman should forget her infant, so as not to have pity upon the son of her womb, yet will He not forget that church, which by the very nails upon the cross, was graven in his hands. (*Isaias* xix. 15, 16). Heaven and earth shall pass away, but his word shall not fail. (*Matt.* xxiv. 35.)

The chair on which the holy father is borne has been awarded to his predecessors and to him by the affection of their flock; it has not been called for by their ambition. In 751 the Roman people bore Stephen II. upon their shoulders to the basilic of St. John of Lateran after his election. In 1831 the Roman people took Gregory XVI. in triumph through their city. In the long interval of nearly 1100 years how many

instances does the Papal history furnish to us of similar manifestations of affectionate attachment! However the disaffection of a few, and the bad principles of others might create transient difficulties in the administration of the state; no people under heaven enjoy a more mild and paternal government than do the subjects of the holy father's temporal dominion. Their industry is free, their taxes are light; they have not, as has happened to others, been mocked with the semblance of a constitution, which only shields the oppressor whilst he scourges them at home, and calumniates them abroad. No, the mild and affectionate sway of the Holy See may indeed appear somewhat deficient in energy, but it is never even unkind. If then the people desire to show the estimation in which they hold their sovereign, when, on three or four solemn occasions, he is borne in this chair, they do only that which is habitually done by the people of the British Empire, for their representatives in parliament, and in several instances, occasionally, for some of their magistrates, and other popular favourites. They do only, what the children of this spiritual father through the world would unite with them in performing, with feelings of well deserved affection for their apostolic head. The warriors of old raised their generals upon their shields, and bore them thus aloft, as a token of esteem and attachment. And if the people of the Roman States desire to manifest their affection for their paternal ruler, and the Christian world is anxious thus to elevate their bishop of bishops, these are strong evidences of the papal deserts, but not of papal ambition.

The procession, from the very earliest period that the cessation, or even the mitigation of persecution allowed it, was the usual mode in which the bishop was conveyed, in every church, to celebrate the solemn Mass. Tertullian, who lived in 250, adverts to it in his work *Ad uxorem*, lib. ii. caput 4, and in that *de præscript.*, 94. St. Ambrose in the year 388, St. Augustin in his book *De Civ. Dei*, l. xxii. 8, St. Leo, and many other very early writers, who all describe its great solemnity, and many of them its splendour. The present rite in this grand procession, has been very little changed since the fourteenth century. Formerly two acolyths carried the Holy Sacrament before the Pope, to the altar; now this is not done, but the holy father stops at the chapel where it is exposed, to pay his adoration.

The vesting used to take place in the sacristy, where the pontiff laying aside his outer cloak, put on the sacred decoration; now the Pope robes at a throne which is placed at the epistle side, as a substitute for the sacristy.

These vestments have all been enumerated and explained in the first

part of this compilation, with the exception of three, two of which are peculiar to the holy father: these are: first the *Fanon* which is a word of German origin, signifying a veil or banner. This was by old writers called *orale*, though probably it was not used by any pontiff before Innocent III., about the year 1200, and is by some eminent liturgical writers, believed to have been then substituted for the amict, as they then began to wear this latter, inside the alb, whereas formerly it was outside: the fanon is of very thin silk striped of four colours, and edged with gold lace: it is double, and the inner half being put on like a tippet over the alb, the corresponding duplicate is brought over the Pope's head, until after the chasuble is put on, when it is turned over the entire of the other robes, thus coming round the back, chest, and shoulders. The other ornament which is peculiar to the Pope is called a *succinctorium*, and resembles a maniple, upon which there is embroidered the figure of a lamb bearing a red cross; it hangs to the left side, being fastened by a cincture, and is a substitute, according to some, for a purse formerly carried for holding money to be distributed as alms. According to others, it was only a resemblance of the ends of a riband, formerly worn by most bishops as a cincture over the alb, and which was called *balteum pudicitiæ*, or "belt of modesty."

This is still worn in a few churches, but the succinctory is peculiar to the Pope. The bishops and some other dignitaries in the East wear one, or two cases, of a lozenge form, depending at the side, as purses: they seem to have an affinity to this *succinctorium*. The other is the *Pallium*, which is an exceedingly ancient ornament: for many centuries it has been made of wool shorn from the lambs that are blessed on the festival of St. Agnes, and after having been spun, wove, and formed, the ornament itself is blessed by the Pope, on the eve of the festival of SS. Peter and Paul: after which it is left upon the tomb of the apostles at the confession of St. Peter, whence one is sent upon his application, to an archbishop, or other privileged bishop to be worn on certain days within his own jurisdiction, as symbolic of the greater fulness of apostolic authority. But the Pope can wear it every day, and in every place.

It is a sort of *torques* or band of honour, on the neck with pendants before and behind, to show the double care of the apostleship, through fidelity, in which the true honour is to be obtained: the crosses which now decorate it are black, formerly they were red or purple, and pins are fixed in them to represent the nails by which our Saviour was fastened to the cross; but, in more ancient times, it is reasonably conjectured that they were used merely to fasten this to the vestment.

The Pope uses no crosier, unless he should be in the diocess of Treves: for it is said that St. Peter gave his staff to St. Eucherius, its first bishop, who having laid it upon the body of St. Maternus, his companion and successor, he was thereby restored to life: as the sick were healed by the handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul (*Acts* xix. 12.) and by the shadow of St. Peter, (*Acts* v. 15.) Another reason is also given, viz.: that the crosier being bent at its summit shows a restricted jurisdiction, whereas that of the sovereign pontiff is unlimited. There can be no question, however, but that the holy father formerly received, on the occasion of his inauguration, a *ferula* which served the purposes of a crosier; but whether it was originally bent or not, is a question now not easily solved.

Commencement of the Office: After the homage the pontiff has his mitre taken off, and standing, he repeats the Lord's prayer, and the angelical salutation in a low voice; then making the sign of the cross, he intones the *Deus in adjutorium*, and so forth, "O God come to mine aid," which the choir answers, and they continue the office for the third hour, whilst the holy father reads a preparation for Mass, during which the proper attendants put on his sandals. Being divested of his cope, the sacristan who stands at the altar sends to him the vestments, successively, by the hands of the voters of the signature, and abbreviators of the park: and he is vested by the cardinals who assist to the throne, after which he concludes with the prayer of the hour, and blesses the incense.

The officers of the altar now go forward to the left, towards the large throne which terminates the choir, and then turning to the right, they face to the altar, and approach it in the following order, viz.: the thurifer with incense, the cross-bearer, sub-deacon, with four acolyths on his right, and three on his left, Greek sub-deacon; Greek deacon; the latin sub-deacon, carrying the book of the Gospel with the Pope's maniple, the cardinal-deacon of the Gospel, the cardinal-bishop assistant, two cardinal-deacons assistants, two auditors of the Rota, first master of ceremonies, the Pope, two private chamberlains assistants, auditor of the Rota, in charge of the mitre, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops assistants at the throne.

His holiness having arrived near the altar, the three junior cardinal-priests, who are on his left as he approaches, advance successively to meet him, and to embrace him, each does so in turn, after having made a profound inclination. Formerly, it was usual, at his approach to the altar, for the sovereign pontiff, and indeed for every bishop on solemn

occasions, to give the kiss of peace to his brethren, in fulfilment of that of the Saviour. (*Matt.* v. 24). The restriction of the number to three curtailed the ceremony, and mystically exhibited the homage paid by the three wise men to the Saviour (*Matt.* ii. 11); and the salutation upon the cheek showed their acknowledgement of the human nature of the Redeemer, which appeared manifest to all; and that upon the breast gave token of their confession of the divine nature which lay concealed.

The Mass has some peculiarities which shall be noticed; but the explanation contained in the first part of this compilation, is essential for those who desire to view what occurs with any intelligence.

The epistle and Gospel are sung, each, first in Latin and then in Greek.

There are two credence tables, one with five candles, upon which the deacon's plate is laid,—another with two candles, upon which the sacristan has what he supplies. These are on the epistle side; on the Gospel side is a third credence table, which is called the Pope's. Towards the conclusion of chaunting the creed, the sacristan and his attendants carry the sacred vessels to this latter credence, where they are washed, and the keeper of the cellar drinks some of the wine and water which he furnishes for the washing; the cruets are also supplied from what has been thus proved, and are carried to the platform where the cardinal-deacon is preparing the bread. When the holy father goes to the altar for the offertory, the sacristan eats in his presence two particles pointed out by the cardinal-deacon, from three hosts which he has sent for sacrifice, and also drinks some of the wine and water. There is not any clue to discover when this apparently unnecessary precaution to guard against poison has been introduced.

Before the preface, the master of ceremonies calls the two junior cardinal-deacons, who go one to each side of the altar, standing with their faces turned to each other, as representing the angels who were at the monument. (*John* xx. 12.) They remain until the Pope leaves the altar for communion. This, of course, is peculiar to Easter.

After the consecration, the tube through which the Pope and the cardinal-deacon receive the sacrament, are purified with ceremonies similar to what had been used respecting the chalice.

As had been remarked in the explanation of the Mass, the canon concluded before the Lord's prayer,—that prayer being said, its sequel and the communion form the remainder.

Communion of the Pope. It was an ancient custom in the Church of Rome, for the holy father, after the conclusion of the canon, to leave

the altar, and retiring to his place in the midst of the bishops and priests who celebrated with him, to wait until the attendants brought the consecrated Host and chalice from the sacred table to his seat; where, having made his preparation, he had the bread of life divided with his assistants, and taking but a small portion from the chalice, he committed to his deacon the dispensation of the rest. In perhaps every other church, this was done at the place where the consecration itself was made; but the ancient documents show us, that, from the earliest period to which we can trace our ritual orders, the custom of the Holy See was that here described.

When communion was given forth under both kinds in the Latin Church, at an early period, in several places, narrow tubes were introduced for the purpose of drawing from the chalice a portion of the sacred blood. We find them in existence about the sixth and seventh centuries, and then they were not regarded as a novel introduction. Several causes led to the adoption of this expedient; amongst which that of guarding against spilling the contents, was not the least. Besides, it frequently happened that some natural and insurmountable delicacy prevented persons from applying their lips to a vessel from which another had just drank. Instances of this were by no means uncommon. But when the discipline was changed, and those who assisted as ministers with the pontiff, no longer communicated at his Mass, the holy father remained, as others did, at the altar, and the tube fell into disuse. But still it was very properly determined, that some vestiges of ancient usages should be preserved; and on grand pontifical festivals, the deacon and sub-deacon communicate with his holiness under both kinds, and this fistula or syphon again on those occasions appears; again, also, on those days, the pontiff leaves the altar after the *Agnus Dei*, having given the peace at the usual time to the assistant-bishop and two assistant-deacons; then, having adored the Sacrament, departs for his throne.

The cardinal-deacon of the Gospel remains at the altar, and when he observes the holy father in his place, after paying his homage to the holy Eucharist, he exhibits his bread upon the paten, under what is called the golden star; turning on each side to present it for adoration, he then delivers it to be carried by the sub-deacon to the throne; the deacon exhibits the chalice in like manner, and carries it himself. He stays with this vessel, on the right of the holy father, the sub-deacon on his left. After having said the usual preparatory prayers, the Pope breaks the Sacred Host, and takes one of the particles for his own communion; soon afterwards he breaks the remainder into two parts, for the purpose of administering it to his deacon and sub-deacon. The

deacon presents the chalice, and the assistant-bishop the tube, through which the pontiff imbibes a portion of the sacred blood.

The deacon stands near the holy father, and the sub-deacon kneels; both receive from his hand particles of the host that he has broken, previous to which, each of them kisses his hand, and, after communion, he embraces each. They depart for the altar, the deacon carrying the chalice and syphon, and the sub-deacon the paten which he purifies over the chalice; the deacon takes a portion of the blood through the tube, and leaves the chalice to the sub-deacon, who drinks the remainder, and purifies the vessel. Meantime the holy father takes an ablution from another chalice presented by the assistant cardinal-bishop.

Several mystic explanations are given; the chief amongst them are founded upon the principle that Christ was put to death openly before the multitude upon Mount Calvary, as the holy father is elevated upon this platform, and takes communion openly before the body of the faithful. This is more fully developed, when we consider that the Saviour first instituted this holy sacrifice, and commenced his mystic offering where He consecrated the Holy Eucharist upon the table in the chamber,—but he perfected and consummated it upon the mount, where He was put to death before the multitude; so his venerable vicar consumes upon the floor of the throne, in presence of the assembly, that body and blood which he had consecrated at the altar in presence of his attendants.

Communion of the other Deacons, the Laity, and so forth. The deacon now coming to the foot of the throne, chaunts the confession, after which the Pope, reciting the usual form of prayer on behalf of those who are to go to communion, administers the Eucharist, under the appearance of bread only, to the cardinal-deacons, and noble laity or magistrates, some of whom make their Easter communion on this occasion. Afterwards, his fingers are purified; his hands are washed after he has the mitre placed on his head, and he goes to the altar and concludes the Mass.

The holy father, coming down from the altar, lays aside the mitre and pallium, resumes the tiara, and goes to his portable chair, where he is approached by the cardinal arch-priest of St. Peter's, accompanied by two canons sacristans, and presented with a purse of embroidered white velvet, which contains the usual offering made to his holiness for singing mass in that basilic. The offering is given in the name of the chapter. The Pope receives it, and hands it to his deacon, to whose train-bearer it is consigned as a perquisite.

His holiness is then carried to a kneeling stool in the midst of the

church, but with only two of the acolyths, and unattended by the Latin sub-deacon, or by the Greek deacon or sub-deacon; neither does the incense-bearer go, nor are the mitres carried. After laying aside his tiara, and kneeling to venerate the relics, which are again exhibited from the ends of the balcony by one of the canons, attended by two of his brethren, the holy father and his attendants rise; he goes back to his chair, and resumes his tiara; the cardinals and bishops wear their mitres, and the procession advances to the gallery in front of the edifice, where the venerable father of the faithful calls down the blessings upon the assembled multitude, in the same form by which he besought heaven to bestow its benediction upon them on the preceding Thursday.

Whilst the cardinal dean in the name of the sacred college felicitates the successor of Peter on the recurrence of the festival, the sounds of martial music and the joyous roar of artillery scarcely permit the emulative bells sometimes to make their gratulating peals heard, as they mingle in celebrating the glorious resurrection.

PROCESSION FOR EASTER SUNDAY.

Esquires,
two and two, in red serge cappas with hoods over the shoulders, &c,
Proctors of the College,
two and two, in black stuff cappas with silk hoods.
Procurators of Religious Orders,
two and two, in the habits of their respective orders.
Ecclesiastical-chamberlains, outside the city,
two and two, in red.
Chaplains in ordinary,
in red cappas with hoods of ermine; of which there are
first mitre bearer,
second mitre bearer,
third mitre bearer,
one bearer of the tiara.
Private Chaplains,
two and two, red cappas and hoods of ermine.
Consistorial-advocates,
two and two, in black or violet cassocks and hoods.
Ecclesiastical-chamberlains,
private and honorary, two and two, in red cassocks and hoods.
Choristers of the Chapel,
two and two, in violet silk cassocks, over which are surplices.

Abbreviators of the Park,
Clerks of the Chamber,
in surplices, over rochets, two and two.
Master of the Sacred Palace,
in his habit of a Dominican friar.
Auditors of the Rota,
in surplices, over rochets, two and two.
Incense bearer.

Three Acolyths, in surplices over rochets carrying large candlesticks with lights,

Cross bearer. in tunic.

Four Acolyths, in surplices over rochets carrying candlesticks with lights.

Two *porters of the red rod.*

Greek Sub-Deacon. *Latin Sub-deacon* in tunic. *Greek Deacon.*

Penitentiaries of St. Peter's,
two and two, in albs and chasubles.

Swiss Guard.

Mitred Abbots,
of whom only a few are entitled to a place.
BISHOPS, ARCHBISHOPS, AND PATRIARCHS,
two and two, the Latins wearing copes and mitres,
the Easterns in their proper costumes.

Swiss Guard.

CARDINAL-DEACONS,
in dalmatics and mitres, each accompanied by his chamberlain carrying his square cap, and followed by his train bearer,
CARDINAL-PRIESTS,
in chasubles and mitres, similarly attended.
CARDINAL-BISHOPS,
in copes and mitres, similarly attended.
General staff and officers of the guard of nobles.
Grand herald and grand esquire,
in court dresses.
Lay Chamberlains,
Conservators of Rome, and Prior of the magistrates of Wards,
in vestures ornamented with cloth of gold.

Swiss Guard, Mace-bearers, Guards of Nobles,

PRINCE-ASSISTANT AT THE THRONE,
in a splendid court dress.
GOVERNOR OF ROME,
in rochet and cappa.
Two Auditors of the Rota,
to serve as train bearers.
Two principal masters of ceremony.

Swiss Guard, Mace-bearers, Guards of Nobles,

CARDINAL-DEACON CARDINAL-DEACON CARDINAL-DEACON

for the Latin Gospel and Mass.

2d assistant at the throne, *Fan* borne by a private chamberlain

1st assistant at the throne, *Fan* borne by a private chamberlain

THE POPE,

wearing a white cope and tiara,

borne in his chair by twelve supporters in red damask, under a canopy sustained by eight referendaries of the signature, in short violet mantles over rochets. His holiness is surrounded by his household. Six of the Swiss guards, representing the Catholic cantons, carry large drawn swords on their shoulders.

Private chamberlain. *Dean of the Rota* in rochet and cappa. Private Chamberlain.

MAJOR-DOMO, AUDITOR OF THE APOSTOLIC CAMERA, TREASURER.

in rochets and cappas.

Prothonotaries apostolic.

Regent of the Chancery, and auditor of contradictions,

all in rochets and cappas, two and two.

Generals of Religious Orders,

two and two, in their proper habits.

PENITENTIAL AUSTERITIES

[The following Essay was written in reply to a Letter from a Protestant correspondent requesting an answer to the reasoning of Dr. Paley, in his *Evidences of Christianity,* respecting austerities, and appeared in the columns of the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* for 1824.]

SECTION I

We did not, in establishing this *Miscellany*, give, directly or indirectly, any pledge that we would admit into its columns attacks upon the doctrines or practices of the Roman Catholic Church; nor did we promise to take up for explanation such doctrines or practices as we might be called upon to explain or to defend. We left ourselves at perfect liberty to take up what doctrine we pleased, and at such time as we may think proper; for though we trust we should be able to defend any of our tenets at any moment, considerations of delicacy or of prudence may suggest to us reasons for postponement. We are led to these remarks, in order that the insertion of the following letter should not be quoted as a precedent to oblige us on future occasions to comply with a like request. We must in all cases, be considered at full liberty to use our own discretion.

"CHARLESTON, July 28, 1824.

"*To the Editor of the United States Catholic Miscellany.*

"Sir:—I am a Christian from conviction, an Episcopalian from choice. I have found much pleasure and great improvement in reading the works of Dr. Paley. To his enlightened and rational piety, I hope you would not object. He, sir, has had opportunities of knowing the practices of your communion; yet, sir, no one of your divines has ever, that I could learn, attempted to answer his clear, dispassionate, and dignified condemnation of many of your errors. I take the liberty of sending you one of many passages of his, which I have marked, as finely illustrating true, sober, rational, and devotional Christianity: such, sir, as I find it in the Reformed Episcopalian Church; and reproving in a clear and dignified way, void of asperity, and evincing truth, the changes which men have made in the doctrines of God. Believe me, sir, I am actuated by no hostile feeling, nor am I led to this by any idle curiosity. Should you think that publishing or noticing the passage, or this letter, would be productive of any unpleasant altercation, you would oblige me by your silence; should you think otherwise, may I beg of you to publish the passage and your answer, for I am impelled by more than curiosity to ask, is it possible that anything can be clearer than the Doctor's reasoning?

"You would oblige me by not using my manuscript in any way to lead to a discovery, which I feel it would be indelicate to attempt, as the question is not personal. You will destroy it when you read it; and if you publish it, copy, or procure its being copied by a friend. I am, sir, respectfully,

No Monk.

"Our Lord enjoined no austerities. He not only enjoined none as absolute duties, but he recommended none as carrying men to a higher degree of Divine favour. Place Christianity in this respect, by the side of all institutions which have been founded in fanaticism, either of their author, or of his first followers; or rather compare, in this respect, Christianity as it came from Christ, with the same religion after it fell into other hands; with the extravagant merit very soon ascribed to celibacy, solitude, voluntary poverty; with the rigours of an ascetic, and the vows of a monastic life; the hair shirt, the watchings, the midnight prayers, the obmutescence; the gloom and mortification of religious orders, and of those who aspired to religious perfection."—Extract from Paley's *Evidence of Christianity*, Part ii. chap. ii. 3d division, paragraph ii.

We have thus far complied with the wish of our correspondent, for we confess ourselves to be of opinion, that all our differences admit of friendly discussion; and from the style of his letter, we do believe he is not influenced by any hostile feeling. We shall now proceed to comply with the second part of his request, namely, to give our answer. The desire of his concluding paragraph has been religiously attended to.

We must premise that frequently a short objection requires a long answer, and Dr. Paley's charge upon our church, in this paragraph, though comprised in a few words, contains a great deal of matter; it will require many paragraphs in return. We do not recollect to have seen any work by a Catholic divine in answer to the Doctor's charges. We have not for the Doctor all the respect which our correspondent appears to feel. But the question for examination is not, whether Paley did or did not know the practices of our communion—nor whether the Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, is more rational, more pious, more sober than ours: the only question to be examined, we believe, is, whether the Doctor's assertions are true in fact. To that we shall confine ourselves.

We take Dr. Paley's first assertion, "Our Lord enjoined no austerities," to be so extremely vague, that we must lay it aside for the present, until we shall come to its precise meaning, after having examined other portions of his sentence. We then proceed to the second assertion: "He not only enjoined none as absolute duties, but he recommended none as carrying men to a higher degree of divine favour." These two assertions are all that he has regarding our divine Lord.

Now, our object is to inquire what the Doctor means by "austerities." We believe we are correct when we say that he ranks "celibacy," "solitude," "voluntary poverty," and so forth, under the head of "austerities." Let us then ask, did our blessed Lord not recommend celibacy to some persons? We take the Doctor's own version of the Bible,—that is King James's version, as it is usually styled,— and we say that it puts us upon very inferior ground, on account of the imperfection of its translation, especially in those very passages which we now want. Still, we will not shrink from using those very passages, incorrect as we believe the translation to be.

In chapter xix. of *St. Matthew's Gospel*, the Pharisees consult our blessed Lord upon the subject of marriage. After his answer we read in verses:

"10. His disciples say unto him, if the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.

"11. But he said unto them, all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

"12. For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

Now, we believe the meaning of the passage to be this. Our blessed Lord had brought back marriage to its original state, the indissoluble union of one man with one woman. Upon which, some of his hearers said this was so difficult a situation from its bond, that it would not be good to marry; of course whoever remained unmarried, was to continue in a state of celibacy. Our Lord proceeds farther, and shows that some persons are obliged to remain in this state from natural causes, some from their defective birth, others from subsequent injury. Thus, he shows that it is not an unusual, nor, perhaps, an unhappy state. But he has already informed them that all could not, or, as our translation has, would not enter upon this state in preference to a married state, which was not only lawful, but sanctified; there would, however, be exceptions, and the exceptions would consist, amongst others, of those who would remain in as perfect a state of celibacy as they who had been previously alluded to; but would, themselves, voluntarily choose this state for a special reason, viz., the kingdom of heaven's sake; and he recommends it in these words, according to that version, in stronger according to ours: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

Thus, it is clear that our Lord did state, without condemnation, the fact that persons did, for the "kingdom of heaven's sake," that is for a high degree of divine favour, place themselves in a state in which others

were not placed; there was a distinction drawn by our Lord between two classes, verse 11, "All cannot receive this saying;" that is, all cannot do this which we speak of. He does not say, "no one can do it," but he says, "all cannot do it." Then some can do it; yes, for he shows the exception, verse 11, "save to whom it is given." Then some can do what all cannot do. What is it they can do which all cannot? Verse 10 informs us, "It is not good to marry." Yes, says the Lord, all cannot avoid marriages, but some to whom it is given can avoid it; the distinction is then clear. But why will they refrain? verse 12 informs us, "there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Thus, these persons do not abstain from such causes as the other two enumerated before, but voluntarily "they made themselves so;" not by unjustifiable injury to themselves, but by voluntary abstinence, for obtaining a higher degree of divine favour. If they were not to obtain a higher favour for a higher sacrifice, the act would be irrational. Our Lord distinctly approves and recommends it by his permission, we would almost call it a command, to those some to whom it is given. Verse 12, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Let those who feel that it is given to them to abstain from marriage, live in celibacy—all cannot, some can. Let those who can do so, remain in that state, for the kingdom of heaven's sake.

With respect to translation, we feel the objection much stronger in the next passages which we shall produce, but we shall waive that. Our correspondent will not, we trust, think that we go too far in saying, that we have reason to believe our Lord did recommend to some persons, though certainly not to all, a state of celibacy—nor will he think us unreasonable, we presume, in our belief, that when to those he held out a special prospect, the kingdom of heaven's sake, it was to carry them to a higher degree of the divine favour, without undervaluing the state of marriage.

We purposely abstain at present from adducing many arguments, from various other topics which would, we have no doubt, materially aid in establishing the fact, that our Lord did recommend celibacy to some persons, upon the very ground that the Doctor writes he did not, as we wish to be as concise as possible. But we shall adduce one from the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.

The Doctor informs us in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, chapter iii., No. 1: "It appears that this letter to the Corinthians was written by St. Paul, in answer to one which he had received from them; and the seventh and some of the following chapters, are taken up in resolving certain doubts and regulating certain points of order concerning which the

Corinthians in their letter had consulted him." We differ with the Doctor in the exposition which we next quote, but shall suppose him to be perfectly correct. Enumerating the doubts, and so forth, he writes, "the rule of duty and prudence relative to entering into marriage, as applicable to virgins and widows." We merely beg leave to observe what, if the Doctor could answer, we believe he would admit, that the context makes it plain, virgins of both sexes are meant.

Now, it will be admitted that St. Paul knew the spirit of our Lord's precepts and advice. Let us then hear what he answers:

I Corinthians chapter vii., verse 25. "Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful."

Upon this we shall merely remark that it is plain the Apostle testifies that there was no command to marry. Hence that entering into the marriage state, or leading a life of celibacy are equally within the free choice of every Christian. This, we believe, is the meaning of the Apostle in verse 28.

"But, and if thou marry thou hast not sinned, and if a virgin marry she hath not sinned."

And also of the following verses, viz., 36 and 37:

"But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely towards his virgin, if she pass the flower of her age, and need so require; let him do what he will, he sinneth not, let them marry.

"37. Nevertheless, he that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but having power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well."

Thus, we say, the Apostle distinctly informs us that there is no command of the Lord for celibacy; no command for marriage. Therefore a life of celibacy is not forbidden by our Lord. Indeed, unless we mistake, we have before shown from his own words, that he recommended it to some, not to all. But the Apostle now proceeds to give his "judgment," and in what capacity? We see that he gives it as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.—That is as a public interpreter of the divine will, through the mercy of God is a faithful interpreter thereof.

"26. I suppose therefore that this is good for the present distress. I say, that it is good for a man so to be.

"27. Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.

"28. But, if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless, such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

"29. But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth that both they that have wives be as though they had none.

"30. And they that weep as though they wept not; and they that rejoice as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy as though they possessed not;

"31. And they that use this world as not abusing it: for the fashion of this world passeth away.

"32. But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord.

"33. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, and how he may please his wife.

"34. There is this difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

"35. And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that you may attend upon the Lord without distraction.

"36. But if any man think that he behaveth, and so forth," as above and 37.

"38. So then he that giveth her in marriage, doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage, doeth better.

"39. The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

"40. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also, that I have the Spirit of God."

Upon the whole of this we will only remark, that having declared that there was no law or commandment binding persons to marriage, or to celibacy, but that each state was equally optional for Christians, the Apostle now gives his judgment, as a faithful interpreter of the Lord's will, and led, as he thought, by the Spirit of God, and that judgment is, that a state of celibacy is better than a state of marriage, which decision is unquestionably given in verse 38; and besides the reasons which Dr. Paley and others insinuate for this decision, viz.: a preference of a single to a married state, on account of the distress of present persecution; for the other reasons given in verses 32, 33, 34, 35, and 40, which reasons are not temporary, which have no concern with a state of persecution rather than any other state, but rest wholly upon the kingdom of heaven's sake.

In the previous part of this chapter, the Apostle, writing concerning the duties of married persons to each other, which was apparently the first topic proposed, after laying down those duties, recommends, as we read:

"5. Defraud us not one the other, except it be with the consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.

"6. But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment.

"7. For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.

"8. I say, therefore, to the unmarried and the widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I.

"9. But if they cannot contain let them marry."

Upon this we make but two remarks: one of the fact that St. Paul did lead a life of celibacy; the other, that he would recommend what he would wish; and he did wish that others should live in that state in which he lived.

But what, it may be asked, has St. Paul's recommendation to do with the question? Dr. Paley's statement was, that our Lord recommended not celibacy as carrying men to a higher degree of divine favour. Our answer is, we have produced our Lord's own recommendation, and lest there should remain a doubt of our proper explanation of its meaning, we adduce the recommendation of St. Paul, who taught exactly the same doctrine which was taught by our Lord.

Now we might introduce several passages from other parts of the inspired writings, to show that our exposition of our Lord's doctrine was in accordance with the doctrine of St. John and other inspired writers. We might introduce the facts and writings of the eminent Christians of the first three ages to show that they believed as we do, that our Lord did teach what Dr. Paley asserts he did not teach regarding, what he is pleased to term, "the extravagant merit very soon ascribed to celibacy;" and would conclude that the Gospel is plain, the Acts of the Apostles furnish us with facts, the earliest history gives us examples; the inspired Epistles, and the Revelations of St. John are distinct, and the earliest writers are clear upon the subject, that our Lord did teach that a state of celibacy entered upon and persevered in with the proper dispositions, did carry men to a higher degree of Divine favour, and therefore did recommend it. All this was centainly very soon, because it was coeval with Christianity. We know that extravagant encomia might have been bestowed upon the state by unguarded eloquence or by thoughtless fanaticism; but the Doctor and our correspondent belong, we have no doubt, to that class of men who can distinguish between the calm assertion of the superiority of a state, for a special purpose, and an extravagant encomium bestowed upon that state. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, which is that of those very soon ages, leaves extravagant hyperbole which may outrage common taste and almost common sense, though it should not contradict truth, to the rejection and the reproof of all sober minds, but calmly asserts that our blessed Lord did teach that such a state of celibacy as we described, was preferable to a state of marriage, though the

married state is holy and honourable, but that all are not called to this latter state.

Dr. Paley was Archdeacon of Carlisle, which is a very respectable living in the Church of England; of course the Doctor subscribed his assent and consent to the thirty-nine articles of that Church, and amongst others to the following article:

"The *Second Book of Homilies*, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for those times, as doth the former *Book of Homilies*, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people."

Now, in the *Book of Homilies*, as set forward in the time of Edward the Sixth, is a homily or sermon against adultery, in three parts, near the conclusion of the third part of which is the following sentence:

"Finally, all such as feel in themselves a sufficiency and ability, through the working of God's Spirit, to lead a sole and continent life, let them praise God for his gift, and seek all possible means to maintain the same; as by reading of the holy Scriptures, by godly meditations, by continual prayers, and such other virtuous exercises."

Should our correspondent belong to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, he will please to recollect, that this "article is received by his Church, so far as it declares the book of Homilies to be an explication of Christian doctrines, and instructive in piety and morals." He will also please to recollect that on the 20th of May, 1814, the House of Bishops in General Convention of the Church, made this Book of Homilies a work to be studied, and a knowledge of the contents of which would be indispensably required from candidates for ordination; and that in consequence the said books were published in New York in 1815. Thus both Archdeacon Paley, and we should suppose our correspondent, could have but little difficulty in embracing the Roman Catholic principle, which neither binds any individual to marriage nor to celebacy except upon the full, free and unbiassed choice and determination of the party concerned. Our Church indeed teaches what we have above exhibited, and as yet we are to learn that it is condemned therefor by either the Church of England, or by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. Where God leaves persons free, she does not bind, and if God shall give to any person the sufficiency and the ability to lead a sole and continent life, and this person had determined to lead such life, she thinks it would be equally cruel to compel such persons to marriage, as to compel one desirous of marriage to enter a cloister. For our part, we can see no difference between the tyranny in one case, and in the other; either is criminal. We have frequently

heard and read of cases of criminal compulsion to a religious profession, but we speak from our own experience, when we assert that we never knew of a case where an individual was compelled or induced by force, threat, or entreaty, to enter a convent; but we have known many cases in which persons desirous of living in a state of celibacy, have been tyrannically forced to marriage. Several in which entreaty, threats, and violence have been used to prevent persons embracing a life of celibacy. The principle of the Roman Catholic Church is not to compel either, but to afford the opportunities for each, and to permit individuals to make their own free choice. This is not fanaticism; this is Christian liberty.

We shall return to the other topics.

SECTION II

Our correspondent will observe that the next topic which naturally presents itself, is that of "the extravagant merit very soon ascribed to solitude." We are not, nor is the church to which we belong, disposed to ascribe extravagant merit to solitude—the Doctor may perhaps deem extravagant what we deem rational; there is not, and there cannot on these subjects be any fixed standard by which reasonableness can be measured, so as to give a scale which will answer for all. The principle in the Roman Catholic Church is now what it has ever been, viz.—That respecting austerities, what would be reasonable for one individual would be extravagant for another, and therefore that the judgment in each case must depend upon the special circumstances of the individual, the time, the place, the connexions, and the other obligations. Hence, in order to guard as much as possible against fanaticism, the church has always had prudent, pious, and well-informed men of experience in official stations, and she has requested of her children not to undertake any extraordinary practices of devotion without the consent of those authorized guides, and where the acts of those who consulted them and followed their advice were seen to be extravagant, the advisers were deemed incompetent and others better qualified were substituted in their places; and in order to aid those advisers, some of the best maxims of the best and wisest eminent Christian writers were appointed for their study, and some of the most respectable tribunals are always ready to aid in the solution of their difficulties. It does not then carry upon its face the semblance of fanaticism, to use such precautions to afford salutary counsel to those who wish to advance in virtue.

These advisers and these tribunals have as general principles laid

down: that avoiding the distraction of society is a great help to religious wisdom; that they who are neither obliged nor disposed to enter into business or society, are at full liberty to live in retirement more or less, according to their circumstances, and provided they be occupied in the fulfilment of the great duty of prayer, or in the devotional contemplation of God and of heavenly things, or in profitable reading or meditation upon the Holy Scriptures, or manual labour, they serve God well. But that solitude and idleness are destructive to virtue.

Now, that we have so far explained as to know what is meant by the word, we take the Archdeacon's proposition: "Our blessed Lord did not recommend solitude, as carrying men to a higher degree of divine favour."

In the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, chapter xi. 2, we read as spoken by our blessed Lord:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of woman, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

In the 9th verse of that chapter, he called him "more than a prophet." In the vii. chap. of the *Gospel of St. Luke*, we find our blessed Lord use the same expressions. Now we have no doubt that our blessed Lord recommended the conduct of John as carrying men to a higher degree of the divine favour. What was part of that conduct?

In those same chapters we find our blessed Lord testifying by asking a question: "What went ye out in the wilderness to see?"

In the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, chapter iii., we read:

"1. In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea," and so forth.

"3. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying the voice of one crying in the wilderness," and so forth.

"2. As it is written in the prophets, behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare the way before thee.

"3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight.

"4. John did baptize in the wilderness and preach," and so forth.—(*St. Mark* i).

"80. And the child (John the Baptist) grew, and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts until the day of his showing unto Israel."—(*St. Luke* i).

"2. Annas and Caiphas being the High Priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.

"3. And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching," and so forth. —(*St. Luke* iii).

"23. He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," and so forth. —(*St. John* i).

We believe there can be little doubt that the greatest man who was born of woman did, in solitude, bring himself by God's grace to a higher

degree of divine favour than other men. But still we desire to give farther proof to our correspondent, and must adduce our evidence before we make the comment. We mean to show two points.—1. That John the Baptist was he who was to come to Elias before our blessed Lord. 2. That Elias led a life of solitude.

"*Gospel of St. Matthew*, chapter xi.—Our Saviour speaking of John says:

"15. And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come."

Chapter xvii. 10. "And his disciples asked him, saying, why then say the Scribes that Elias must first come?

"11. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things.

"12. But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not," and so forth.

"13. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist."

Gospel of St. Luke, chapter I.—The angel foretelling the birth of John the Baptist to his father:

"17. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias."

Of course it is well known that Elias and Elisha are but two names for the same individual.

First Book of Kings, in the Catholic version *third*, chapter xiii.:

"2. And the word of the Lord came unto him, (Elias,) saying,

"3. Get thee hence, and turn thee eastward, and hide thyself by the brook Cherith, that is beyond the Jordan.

"4. And it shall be, that thou shalt drink of the brook, and I have commanded the ravens to feed thee there."

In the first chapter of the next book of Kings, we find that this prophet resided upon the solitude of Mount Carmel, was a hairy man, girt with a girdle of leather round his loins. John the Baptist lived in the wilderness, being girt round his loins with camel's hair, and living upon locusts and wild honey, and was filled with the spirit of Elias. These have always been considered the two great founders of institutions for solitude and retirement, and have been certainly recommended by our blessed Lord for their virtues, which raised them to a higher degree of divine favour.

The example of our blessed Lord, so far as it can be imitated, must be considered his most efficacious recommendation.

Gospel of St. Matthew, chap. iv.

"1. Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness."

Chap. xiv. 23. "And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when the evening was come, he was there alone."

St. Mark, i. 12. "And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness.

"13. And he was there in the wilderness forty days;

"35. And in the morning rising up a great while before day, he went out and departed to a solitary place, and there prayed.

Chapter vi. and vii. show that he was in the habit of retiring with his disciples into the desert, or solitudes, whither the people followed him, so that they sometimes had been three days without food.

St. Luke, iii. 1. "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness."

Chapter v. 16. "And he withdrew himself into the wilderness, and prayed."

Chapter vi. 12. "And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.

St. John, x. 40. "And went away again beyond the Jordan, into the place where John first baptized: and there he abode."

We have very little doubt, that the days and weeks when our blessed Lord was not actually occupied in his public instructions, and the display of his power, were spent with his disciples in solitude; that his retreat was frequently broken in upon by those who desired instruction; that in this solitude he taught some of his best lessons, before and after his resurrection, is evident; that in this solitude he explained to his disciples his parables, and taught them the mysteries of the kingdom of God, is apparent; and that he occasionally withdrew altogether, and gave himself to days and nights of prayer, is unquestionable. A very few references will also show that he recommended such retirement, as raising man to a higher degree of the divine favour:

Matthew vi. 6. "But when thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy father which is in secret," and so forth.

Thus he recommends the mode which he had practised; and when we read in the 49th verse of the xxiv, chapter of *St. Luke's Gospel*, his recommendation to his Apostles, as to how they were to spend the time between his ascension and their being fully commissioned by the Holy Ghost. We find that mode explained by the recital of the fact, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, chapter i. 13, 14, in the solitude of an upper room, with one accord in prayer and supplication.

Thus we apprehend that it may safely be said that our blessed Lord did recommend, as raising man to a higher degree of divine favour, the "solitude for religious meditation and prayer, and the midnight prayers," which were the great characteristics of Elias, and so many others who imitated his mode of living upon Mount Carmel, amongst whom perhaps were Simeon, who is commended in the Gospel of *St. Luke*, ii. 25, and Anna, of whom it is written in the same chapter:

"36. And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: she was of a great age, and had lived with an husband, seven years from her virginity;

"37. And she was a widow of about four-score and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers, night and day."

Our blessed Lord recommendeed the religious practices of St.

John the Baptist, a principal one of which was this solitude; he recommended it to all, in some degree, as a preparation for the act which specially raises man to a higher grade of divine favour, viz., prayer; he recommended it to his Apostles, and we find them practise it as far as their public duties would admit; we also perceive that our Lord spent much of his own time in solitude, and led his disciples thereto; that he prayed frequently at night, and sometimes all night; and very soon indeed, for immediately, the practice was continued in his church, as the earliest writers allege, upon his recommendation, as well as in imitation of himself and of his friends, associates, and disciples. We forbear adducing a considerable portion of other evidence, that would to any mind establish facts distinctly, to which we have only alluded in this place. But, we now say, that well-regulated solitude is a considerable help to solid piety; and the Archdeacon of Carlisle was too hasty, when he wrote that our blessed Lord did not recommend solitude, watchings, and midnight prayers, as carrying man to an higher degree of divine favour.

Now, the good Archdeacon himself, tells us of the blessed Lord, towards the end of the same chapter ii., under the head the character of Christ, second paragraph of the topic secondly:

"Thus we see the devoutness of his mind, in his frequent retirement to solitary prayer," and so forth.

The Doctor refers to *Matthew* xiv. 23, xxvi. 36, and *Luke* ix. 28, for his proofs; and in the next paragraph, we read thus:

"Our Saviour's lessons, besides what has been already remembered in them, touch, and that oftentimes, by very affecting representations, upon some of the most interesting topics of human duty and of human meditation; upon the principles by which decisions of the last day will be regulated, (*Matt.* xx. and 31.) Upon the superior, or rather the supreme importance of religion, (*Mark* viii. 35, and *Matt.* vi. 33, *Luke* xii. 4, 5, 16-21.) Upon penitence, by the most pressing calls and most encouraging invitations, (*Luke* xv.) Upon self-denial, (*Matt.* v. 29,) watchfulness, (*Matt.* iv. 42, *Mark* xiii. 37, *Matt.* xxv. 13), and so forth.

We certainly are mistaken, if Archdeacon Paley himself does not here establish our blessed Lord's recommendation, by example, of solitude and midnight prayer and watching, as leading to a high degree of divine favour.

We therefore conceive that the dignitary wrote not what was the fact, but what he wished to have been the fact, when he penned the paragraph copied by our correspondent. The other parts shall be examined.

SECTION III

We may take the next propositions of the Doctor in the passages laid before us, to be: "Our Lord recommended no austerities as carrying men to a higher degree of divine favour." He did not recommend as such "voluntary poverty," to which extravagant merit was very soon ascribed after Christianity, as it came from Christ, fell into other hands.

We certainly felt a little astonished at finding a writer of the Archdeacon's penetrating intellect, judicious views, and deep erudition, deliberately commit himself in this proposition. Certainly Dr. Paley must have read the texts which we shall here subjoin, and many other similar texts, which clearly establish the facts which we shall adduce as proved by them.

Matthew viii. 19. "And a certain scribe came and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

20. "And Jesus said unto him, the foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests; but the son of man hath not where to lay his head."

xvii. 26. "Jesus saith unto him, then are the children free.

27. "Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: and take and give unto them for me and thee."

Luke ix. 57. "And it came to pass, that as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

58. "And Jesus said unto him, foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the son of man hath not where to lay his head."

From these it is evident, that our Lord himself did abide in a state of voluntary poverty. There can be no question but his state was voluntarily taken up, nay, selected by himself; and being houseless, and not having the tribute money to pay, until he had sent his Apostle to catch a fish for its payment, is full evidence of his poverty. That his favourite, St. John the Baptist, was also in a similar state of voluntary poverty, there can be no question. Now let us see his language to his disciples.

Matthew x. 9. "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses.

10. "Nor script for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves."

Mark vi. 8. "And commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse:

9. "But be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats."

Luke ix. 3. "And he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither bread, neither money; neither have two coats a piece."

Chapter x. 4. "Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes."

8. "And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you."

Chapter xxii. 35. "And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, nothing."

We do not think our conclusion would be unwarranted, did we from those texts assert that our Lord commanded some persons to observe voluntary poverty. We shall, however, be now content with deducing as the consequence, that our Lord recommended voluntary poverty to some persons. We shall endeavour now to show why he recommended this virtue, which he practised himself.

Matthew xix. 16. "And behold one came and said unto him, Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?

17. "And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.

18. "He saith unto him, which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness; honour thy father and thy mother: and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

20. "The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?

21. "Jesus saith unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have a treasure in Heaven: and come and follow me.

22. "But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.

23. "Then Jesus said unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven.

24. "And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

25. "When his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, Who then can be saved?

26. "But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With man this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.

27. "Then Peter answered and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?

28. "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

29. "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit eternal life."

St. Mark relates this transaction and discourse in his tenth chapter, and St. Luke in his eighteenth chapter. The only circumstance which is found in either of those, in addition to what we have laid down, is found in the *Gospel of St. Mark*, viz., in the 29th verse is the answer of the young man: "Master, all these have I observed from my youth."

21. "Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing

thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me.''

Now, without any difficulty, we can perceive the facts here related to be the discourse of a young man with our Lord, and the discourse of St. Peter with our Lord. The young man asked what he should do to obtain heaven. Our Lord answers him, keep the commandments. The young man hearing them enumerated, answers that he has not transgressed them. Our Lord loved him. So far we have reason to conclude that this young man was in the divine favour, as having complied with the essential duties of religion. That he was in the divine favour we cannot doubt, for our Lord loved him, and our Lord loves none but those who are in the divine favour. That he was so loved because he had fulfilled the essential duties of religion, we have two reasons for believing—the first, our Lord informed him that the essential duties were those prescribed by the commandments; our second reason is, because the declaration of that affection is subsequent to the exhibition of the fact that he had fulfilled those duties.

Our Lord next tells him, if he will be perfect, to embrace a state of voluntary poverty, and that he will have a treasure in heaven; let us then remark the distinction—the discharge of the essential duties will procure our admittance into the kingdom of heaven; the perfection of doing something beyond that which is of obligation, will secure for us a treasure after our admittance; one of the circumstances of this perfection is voluntary poverty, embraced from a proper motive, with proper dispositions.

Our Lord loves this young man, he is therefore in a certain degree of divine favour. Our Lord recommends to him voluntary poverty for the sake of perfection—to secure a treasure. Surely we are justified in saying our Lord recommended voluntary poverty as raising man to a higher degree of divine favour.

The second fact confirms our doctrine. We have before seen that our Lord recommended voluntary poverty to St. Peter and his associates. The Apostle now states, that they followed that recommendation, and asks what will be the consequence. Our Lord marks out the very highest degree of divine favour—they shall sit upon thrones judging the tribes of Israel on the great day of judgment. Surely our correspondent must feel that the venerable Archdeacon of Carlisle was too hasty in his assertion that our Lord did not recommend voluntary poverty as raising man to a higher degree of the divine favour.

Nor does our Lord confine it to the case of the Apostles; the 29th

verse shows the recommendation to be general and the promise of the recompense is made general also.

Thus, in his first sermon, the very first expression of our Lord is, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven." Certainly we will admit that a voluntary divestment of property, without the true spirit of Christian motive and Christian disposition, would be perfectly useless; but when we treat of external acts, we always suppose the spirit without which the act is useless; upon that principle of the Apostle, "and though I give all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." It would be then gross misrepresentation to state, that the merit or the profit was attributable merely to the external act without the proper spirit. Look to the whole of that admirable discourse, and especially to the part contained in the sixth chapter of *St. Matthew's Gospel*, and it inculcates the very spirit of that voluntary poverty which our Lord did recommend. We cannot avoid selecting those verses.

19. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and where thieves break through and steal.

20. "But lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not dig through nor steal.

21. "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also," and so forth.

Luke xii. 33. "Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, and treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth.

34. For where your treasure is there will your heart be also."

xvi. 9. "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

We will acknowledge that if the Archdeacon did prefer a married to a single life, and was blessed with eight or ten fine children, and besides attending to the things which were the Lord's, and pleasing his wife, he had also to educate his sons and to portion his daughters, and to introduce them into society, and to feel those natural attachments to his children and to his children's children, to the third and fourth generation, and to be divided amongst them; this doctrine would be perhaps a little too severe for him: but it was one which answered very well for St. Paul, for St. John the Apostle, and some others of those who very soon, as the venerable Archdeacon expresses it, took into their hands the maxims of Christianity as delivered by our Lord. They to be sure took these texts in their obvious meaning: and there might also have been some persons like those Pharisees of whom mention is made in the same xvi. chap. of *St. Luke*.

"13. No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and

love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

"14. And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all those things: and they derided him.

"15. And he said unto them, Ye are they who justify yourselves before men: but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abominable in the sight of God."

Indeed we could not help observing that amongst other very serious omissions, made as we thought for very obvious reasons, by Dr. Paley, in the characteristics of our Redeemer, was that of his voluntary poverty and some others which the old writers used to point out. However, we cannot blame the Doctor, because he forgot some writings which were first indited sixteen or seventeen hundred years before he examined some of the documents. There is a system of which voluntary poverty forms one part, celibacy another, solitude another, and a few other such qualities are inseparably connected therewith: like every perfect system, it must have all its parts; and as some of them were a little inconvenient to the Archdeacon's system, the whole were discarded; but he ought not to have asserted against evidence, that this system and all its parts was not recommended by our Lord as carrying man to a higher degree of perfection.

We might have accorded to the Doctor that all men were not commanded to do those things which were generally recommended, and almost commanded to some; thus voluntary poverty or the surrender of private property to a common fund was not commanded, but it was recommended, and it was practised.

Acts iv. 32. "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul: neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things in common.

"34. Neither was there any amongst them that lacked: for as many as were possessers of lands or houses, sold them, and brought the prices of things that were sold.

"35. And laid them down at the Apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man, according as he had need."

Chapter v. 1. "But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession,

"2. And kept back part of the price, his wife being also privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the Apostles' feet.

"3. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land.

"4. Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto man but unto God."

We shall here conclude this topic. It is plain our Lord did rec-

ommend voluntary poverty as leading man to a higher degree of divine favour, and that he practised it himself, and that it was practised by St. John the Baptist, and by the Apostles and by the first Christians; and that it is most useful, for it roots out altogether covetousness, and therefore was specially recommended to the clergy.

I Tim. vi. 8. "And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content.

"9. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition.

"10. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some have coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

"11. But thou, O man of God, flee these things," and so forth.

All men are not bound to voluntary poverty; yet it was recommended by our Lord, and was, indeed, very soon prized in the church, because it was prized from the beginning. We shall endeavour to conclude in our next.

SECTION IV

We have taken the following copies of the sentence which was submitted to our inquiry, viz.—1, celibacy; 2, solitude, watchings and midnight prayers; and, 3, voluntary poverty. We have still left "the rigors of an ascetic, and the vows of a monastic life; the hair shirt, the obmutescence, the gloom and mortification of religious orders and of those who aspired to religious perfection."

Now it is well that we should have distinct notions of our topics; the rigors of an ascetic life are the practice of those special observances which come under examination, therefore the fate of the whole must depend upon the fate of all the parts; if our Lord recommended all the parts, he recommended the entire; next the vows of a monastic life: those vows are celibacy, voluntary poverty, and obedience to a regular superior. We have examined the first two topics: we have only the third remaining to be examined, and in addition the general question, whether our Lord recommended vows as leading to a higher degree of the divine favour; then the hair shirt, the obmutescence, the gloom and mortification, are to be considered.

After having gone through those several topics, we believe we shall have treated the Archdeacon's paragraph with sufficient fulness. But let us first try whether we can fairly dispense with examining any special topic here produced.

"The hair shirt," is but a peculiar species of mortification. If mortification, which comprises all its species, be recommended, each species

which fairly comes under the general head, is recommended; hence we need not enter into any special examination of this topic. The Archdeacon must have known that no Roman Catholic believed that wearing a hair shirt would, as such, raise man to a higher decree of divine favour, nor the wearing of fine linen sink him into disfavour, although some persons who, strange to say, are now considered by Protestants as their gospel predecessors, did object to the Catholic clergy, as an act of great criminality, that they did wear fine linen, and that their bishops were clad in purple; and they quoted Scripture and the very words of our Lord, for proving how correct their doctrine was.

Luke xvi. 19. "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple, and fine linen, and fared sumptously every day.

20. "And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores.

21. "And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

22. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man died and was buried.

23. "And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

24. "And he cried out and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.

25. "But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented."

And when those good folk were asked what ought to be the dress of the clergy, they very readily exhibited,

Mark i. 4. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

5. "And there went out to him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the Jordan, confessing their sins.

6. "And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of skin about his loins, and he did eat locusts and wild honey."

So that if the Doctor now reproaches us with some amongst us wearing hair-cloth, there was a time when they who are called the first Protestants, reproached our predecessors for not wearing hair-cloth. But we put the hair shirt aside, for, except as a species of mortification, it is valueless. We believe, and our church has always believed, that a man may commit gross crimes whilst he is clothed in hair-cloth, and another who is clothed in purple and fine linen may do many acts of virtue.

"Obmutescence," we shall place by its predecessor the hair shirt. In itself it has no merit, no value. But there are times, especially in

religious communities, when silence is very useful for greater purposes than mere obmutescence. The Archdeacon then used fallacy when he exhibited us as believing that obmutescence raised man to a higher degree of divine favour. In a religious community, similar duties are performed by all persons at the same time, and a very useful regulation is, that during the hours allotted to prayer, to meditation, and to study, strict silence shall be preserved, except in those cases where it is absolutely necessary to speak, and then so much only shall be said as may be indispensable, and in as low a tone of voice as possible, and visits of strangers shall be avoided as much as may be, at those hours. This rule of silence is then useful for prayer and meditation, which our Lord recommends as carrying men to a higher degree of divine favour, and is most useful to aid the study of divine truth, an acquaintance with which our Lord does strongly recommend.

"Gloom" is so vague a phrase that we do not know how to treat the topic. No two persons attach exactly the same definite quantity of the idea of seriousness to the expression gloom. We avow that gloom does not raise man to a higher degree of divine favour; our Church does not attach any merit to gloom, on the contrary she wishes her children to enjoy the serenity and cheerfulness arising from a good conscience, and she commends moderate sprightliness. We will only say for ourselves that we have intimately known many of the most severe monasteries of men and women, and mixed in some of the gayest circles of life, and we are not disposed for gloom. We found far more steady and consoling cheerfulness in those monasteries; we have in them found more pure and unalloyed enjoyment, and seen more genuine and heartfelt sprightliness, and found [more] true and luxuriant peace to reign amongst their inmates, than in the revels of the great, the banquets of the wealthy, and the balls of the gay. We solemnly assure our correspondent that Archdeacon Paley did not and could not know, O! he could not feel how erroneous were his notions. Our correspondent probably will, we know certainly that many of our readers will be startled at our assertion. Upon an impartial and dispassionate review of our own observations, we would assert that almost the only earthly happiness we saw come nearest to true bliss was in those abodes. For ourselves we say the only days of true happiness we knew, were days in what the Archdeacon calls "gloom." As well might the negro who toils upon a rice-swamp, be expected to write such a description as Moore gives of the valley of Cashmere, as Archdeacon Paley or a novel-writer know how to describe the feelings of the inmates of a monastery, or the Big Warrior or Red Jacket compile histories of the Grecian and Ottoman dynasties. Several hun-

dreds of persons who lived in religious retirement have written, and very few of their expressions are those of gloom.

We now come to the topic "mortification." What does it mean? Subjecting the flesh to the spirit, for religious purposes by occasional privations of what is pleasing to our sensual appetite. This is what we understand by mortification—celibacy, voluntary poverty, midnight prayers, watchfulness, and so forth, all these are so many parts of mortification. All these have been recommended by our Lord as leading man to a higher degree of divine favour. Fasting is a species of mortification. In the Gospel of St. Luke it is said of the devout Anna, that she served God with fastings and prayers, night and day; this is mortification.

John the Baptist led a life of mortification, and was commended by our Lord as being mortified, "not clad in soft garments."

Matthew, vi. 16. "Moreover when ye fast be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: Verily I say unto you they have their reward.

17. "But when thou fastest, anoint thine head and wash thy face.

18. "That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."

25. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than the meat?" and so forth.

Chapter vii. 13. "Enter ye in at the straight gate, for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat.

14. "Because straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

Chapter ix. 14. "Then came unto him the disciples of John saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?

15. "And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride chamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then they shalt fast."

Chapter x. 38. "And he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me."

Chapter xi. 21. Wo unto thee Chorazin! wo unto thee, Bethsaida, for if the mighty works which have been done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."

Chapter xii. 41. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas."

Jonah, iii. 5. "So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth from the greatest of them, even to the least of them."

Matthew xvii. 21. "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

Chapter xviii. 8. "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off and cast them from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.

9. "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is

better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

Mark, x. 21. "Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way and sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have a treasure in heaven; and come take up the cross and follow me."

Luke, ix. 23. "And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me.

24. "For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it.

25. "For what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?"

Chapter. xiv. 26. "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

The passages here selected are but a portion of many which bear upon the subject, in the record which the evangelists have left us of our Lord's recommendations and commands. Now let us review them and collect their substance. We will find that he recommended, 1, fasting; 2, preference of the spiritual to the sensual enjoyments, even to the length of being careless as to the quality of our food, and the texture of our clothing, and the undervaluing of a limb or an eye when our spiritual progress would be impeded by the retention of either, because spiritual progress would insure heaven, and it would be preferable to be in heaven maimed, or lame, or blind, than having all our limbs to be cast into hell. 3. The giving up not only of limb, but of life, rather than do ourselves spiritual injury. 4. The giving up the fellowship of our dearest connexions, if they interfered with our spiritual progress. 5. The separation from the customs of the world designated by entering at the narrow gate.

Besides, he recommended under peculiar circumstances, 1, repenting in sackcloth and ashes together with fasting, which is what we emphatically style severe penance, 2, self-denial, 3, taking up the cross after having embraced a state of voluntary poverty, having sold possessions and given the proceeds in alms. Will Doctor Paley, will our correspondent after this, say that our Lord did not recommend mortification? Did our blessed Lord not then recommend what St. Paul practised as he informs us?

I Corinthians ix. 27. "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be cast-away."

We acknowledge that the force of this passage is considerably weakened by the intentional mistranslation of the Greek verb, which in the

Doctor's standard book is in the 25th verse rendered into English by the word *temperate*. The proper translation may be found in the Catholic version, and is

25. "Every one that striveth for the mastery *refraineth himself from all* things."

Protestant translation:

25. "Every man that striveth for the mastery is *temperate in* all things."

We have looked in several Lexicons, and we cannot find any authority for the latter translation; the composition of the Greek verb requires a far more forcible English word than *temperance*; the Latin, which has been used very early, is much more forcible than *temperate*.

But the 27th verse is still more distant from the truth of translation, for the word which is translated *keep under*, in the Protestant version, is in the Catholic translated *chastise*; the Latin given in Protestant translations is *obtundo, I pound*; the Greek word is compounded of two words, which signify much more strong expressions than *keep under*. We have indulged in this little digression merely to show one of the reasons why our church does not acknowledge the Protestant version of the Scriptures to be fit for the perusal of her children. She has very many objections, one of which is that by a little softening of phrases in one place, and a little strengthening in others, it is not a faithful expositor of the revealed will of God, and is calculated rather to mislead than to direct. Now, in our quotations from it we have laboured under a great disadvantage from this circumstance, yet with the whole weight of this against us we apprehend that we have shown from the Doctor's own version that he penned too hastily the paragraph which our correspondent has selected. But to return to our subject; the Apostle tells us:

II Corinthians v. 24. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

But let us try the Doctor a little by his own rule. In chapter ii. the *Morality of the Gospel*, near the end, under the head "Character of Christ," the Archdeacon favours us with the following passage:

"Our Saviour's lessons, besides what has been already remarked in them, touch, and that oftentimes by very affecting representations, upon some of the most interesting topics of human duty and human meditation; upon the principles, by which the decisions of the last day will be regulated (*Matt.* xxv. 31, et seq.); upon the superior, or rather the supreme importance of religion (*Mark* viii. 35; *Matt.* vi. 31-33; *Luke* xii. 45, 16-21); upon penitence, by the most pressing calls and the most encouraging invitations (*Luke* xv.); upon self-denial (*Matt.* v. 29): watchfulness, and so forth.

Chapter i. last paragraph but one: We are not, perhaps at liberty to take for granted that the lives of the preachers of Christianity were as perfect as their lessons; but we are entitled to contend, that the observable part of their behaviour,

must have agreed in a great measure with the duties which they taught. There was, therefore, (which is all that we assert) a course of life pursued by them different from that which before they led, and this is of great importance. Men are brought to anything almost sooner than to change their habit of life, especially when the change is either inconvenient or made against the force of natural inclinations, or with the loss of accustomed indulgences."

Last paragraph: "And lastly, that their mode of life and conduct, visibly at least, corresponded with the institution which they delivered, and, so far, was both new, and required continual self-denial."

In the first paragraph of the chapter: "Then as to the kind and degree of exertion which was employed, and the mode of life to which these persons (the Apostles and first Christians) submitted, we reasonably suppose it to be like that which we observe in all others, who voluntarily become missionaries of a new faith. Frequent, earnest, and laborious preaching, constantly conversing with religious persons upon religion, a sequestration from the common pleasures, engagements and varieties of life, and an attention to one serious object, compose the habits of such men. I do not say that this mode of life is without enjoyment, but I say the enjoyment springs from sincerity."

Now, we would ask the venerable Archdeacon whether he has not, in the character of our Lord and of his disciples and Apostles, whether he has not in our Lord's lessons, taken from Scripture, given us a perfect picture of austerity, mortification, in fact of a monastic or conventual life? Of what does it consist? Self-denial, sequestration from the common pleasures, engagements, and varieties of life. Conversation with religious persons upon religious subjects, meditation upon the supreme importance of religion, penitence, watchfulness—we have before, from our Lord's lips, been told of the fastings and repentance in sackcloth and ashes. Now what addition is to be made to give a perfect picture of a monastic life, except celibacy and voluntary poverty, which we have before considered? The Archdeacon must destroy the texts of the Scripture and his own pages if he wishes us to believe the sentence marked by our correspondent was not a tissue of untruths.

But let us now go to the Doctor himself for "gloom," that is proper seriousness upon the supreme concern of religion. In his *Moral Philosophy*: chapter ix, "On Reverencing the Deity:"

"In the sixth paragraph—For as no one ever feels himself disposed to pleasantry, or capable of being diverted with the pleasantry of others, upon matters in which he is deeply interested; so a mind intent upon the acquisition of Heaven, rejects with indignation every attempt to entertain it with jests calculated to degrade or to deride subjects which it never recollects but with seriousness and anxiety. Nothing but stupidity, or the most frivolous dissipation of thought can make even the inconsiderate forget the supreme importance of everything which relates to the expectation of a future state of existence. Whilst the infidel mocks at the superstitions of the vulgar, insults over their credulous fears, their childish errors, or fantastic rites, it does not occur to him to observe that the most preposterous device

by which the weakest devotee ever believed he was securing the happiness of a future life, is more rational than unconcern about it. Upon this subject, nothing is so absurd as indifference; no folly so contemptible as thoughtlessness and levity.''

The principle contained in this is that which the religion that we profess teaches. Serious attention ought to be paid to a paramount concern; no concern can equal that of eternity. But serious attention is not gloom; gloom is rather the companion of despair. But the venerable Archdeacon of Carlisle is not the only writer who has made the accusation of fanaticism against us for those practices. In every age he has had predecessors; one of whom he quotes himself in the close of his second chapter.

''The constancy, and by consequence the sufferings of the Christians of this period, is also referred to by Epictetus, who imputes their intrepidity to madness, or to a kind of fashion or habit; and about fifty years afterwards by Marcus Aurelius, who ascribes it to obstinacy. 'Is it possible (Epictetus asks) that a man may arrive at this temper and become indifferent to those things, from madness, or habit, as the Galileans?' '' (lib. iv., c. 7).

This was a general imputation upon the Christians, that they were fanatics, mad, unsocial, illiberal, bigoted, unfashionable; but this madness was taught by our Lord, was noticed very soon, and having a method in it, has been brought down to the present day amongst us.

We did think we should be able to conclude to-day, but we find it necessary to defer the remaining topic of monastic vows to our next.

SECTION V

We were obliged last week to omit our conclusion of this examination of Archdeacon Paley's paragraph. We now lay it before our readers. The only questions remaining to be disposed of, are, Did our Lord recommend the rigors of an ascetic life? did he recommend the vows of a monastic life as carrying man to a higher degree of divine favour?

The rigors of the ascetic life consist in the practice of those virtues which we have before seen, were recommended by our Lord as carrying man to a higher degree of divine favour. We unhesitatingly answer then, the Archdeacon asserted what the Scripture does not warrant, when he stated that our Lord did not recommend it. But we also add, that every act done by every ascetic is not to be charged upon the general system. It would be bad reasoning to argue against the propriety of man's living in society, because in the social state, he has opportunities and excitements to crimes which he would not know of and could not commit in a different state. It would be bad reasoning to accuse any body of men, generally, with the faults or the

follies of some individuals of that body. It would be a fallacious and a wicked exhibition, if a man were to collect the catalogue of crime and the list of criminals from the courts of a nation, and the catalogue of follies, and the list of the weak-minded through an entire region, and publish both as a correct history of that country. It is true every fact would be correctly given; no false statement could be found in the compilation. Bet we ask would this be a correct history? The publisher would deserve at least the indignant reproof of the insulted community, and the rebuke of every honest man.

There have been hypocrites and fanatics in the religious orders; there have been very few of the former, perhaps a greater number of the latter description amongst the ascetics. But every man who aspires to piety is not the Tartuffe of Moliere's imagination. And the history of the ascetics of our church is very unlike the misrepresentations of their enemies, blending all the real faults and follies of hypocrites and enthusiasts with the immense fictions of the imagination, and either concealing the heroic virtues of persons of whom the world was not worthy, or giving such an occasional tincture of modified and compassionate praise, as would be necessary to keep some semblance of impartiality.

The vows of a monastic life are those of continence, voluntary poverty, and obedience to a regular superior. These topics have been before examined with the exception of obedience. Yet shall it be necessary for us to go through the examination of the question, whether constitutional obedience to a regularly appointed governor is virtuous? And if virtuous, does it not raise man to a higher degree of divine favour? And was not this virtue frequently inculcated by our blessed Lord?

Respecting vows: we were about to write upon the subject, when we received the communication which exhibits the meaning of a prophetic passage of St. Paul, and as we are now closely pressed for room, we shall refer Mr. "No Monk" to that, reserving to ourselves the right of entering more at large thereupon at a future day.

Thus we believe it must be clear that the boasted authority of Doctor Paley is devoid of that truth which ought to be its support, and that what he is pleased to call the fanaticism of Roman Catholics, is more like the doctrine of our blessed Lord, than is what he and his admirer, "No Monk," would call rational Christianity.

We have been diffuse, but we have omitted a far greater quantity of what might properly be inserted, than many of our friends may imagine.

LIBERALITY

[The following short Essay on the *Misuse of the Term "Liberality,"* appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* for 1822.]

SECTION I

We have often been amused at the use made of this word, and at the vague sense in which it is applied to religion. With some persons, a *liberal man* means a person who considers all modes of worship exactly alike, and attends to none. With others, a liberal man is he who gives a preference to one mode, and says, at the same time, that all others are equally good. Others consider a liberal man to be a person who not only gives a preference to one mode, but avows that he considers some others quite erroneous,—at the same time that he considers some others equally good as his own, but does not oppose either. With another class, a liberal man may consistently oppose some sects, and support others, whilst he persecutes none.

Let us for a moment examine those descriptions. The first exhibits to us an irreligious man. But if to be liberal, it be requisite to be irreligious—and that to be saved, it be necessary to be religious—we must candidly avow that we give the preference to religion and salvation; and that we would sacrifice the foolish, empty praise of thoughtless infidelity, to the substantial benefits of peace of conscience here, and eternal glory hereafter. Irreligion is not liberality. Neglect of our duty to our Creator is not liberality. If there be such a being as an atheist, he would by this be the most liberal man in the world.

The second is an irrational man. For, if all modes of worship be alike, if all be equally good, it is quite irrational to give a preference where there is perfect equality; and as preference involves choice founded upon some motive after examination and comparison, the man who gives a preference and says he has no motive, contradicts himself.

Another consideration will exhibit this more clearly. It is a fact, that all the systems of religion differ from each other by their being contradictions to each other; by one asserting exactly what another exactly denies. Thus, one system asserts that Christ revealed, that in the divine nature there are three persons. Another system denies that

Christ revealed, that in the divine nature there are three persons. One system asserts, that Christ established several distinct orders of clergymen in the church. Another system denies that Christ established several distinct orders of clergymen in the church. One system asserts, that Christ instituted seven sacraments. Another system denies that Christ instituted seven sacraments. And so, in every distinct sect, there is at least one distinct tenet of contradiction to all the other sects; and this contradiction is not upon a matter of opinion, but upon a matter of fact. Now, in matters of fact there can be no latitude of opinion; for it is strictly true, that the fact agrees with the assertion, or disagrees with the assertion. Hence, if a man gives a preference to the assertions of one sect, it is ridiculous for him to say I profess to believe the fact to be as stated by this society; but he who denies the truth of that fact also agrees with me; though he denies exactly what I assert, still we both believe the same. This we consider to be the assertion of an absurdity, viz., that the same proposition can be, at the same moment, and in the same sense, true and false. And as we do not consider liberality to be absurdity, we do not consider the person who answers the second description to be a liberal man.

The person described in the third place, is exactly in the same predicament as the persons described in the second; for it makes no difference in the argument whether the assertion be made that two hundred sets of contradictory propositions are at the same time true, or that only two contradictory propositions are true; still, it is the assertion of an absurdity.

The person described in the fourth place differs from the third only in this circumstance, that he opposes by argument, or by not supporting some of those from whom he differs; but he is in exactly the same predicament if he holds certain doctrines; and whilst he holds it to be a fact, that they were revealed by God, holds also that the person who denies this fact, may believe truth in the denial. This contradiction is an evident absurdity.

We have supposed, of course, all through, that God has revealed certain doctrines, and that man can know the fact of God having spoken, and know what doctrine he did reveal when he spoke.

We have been led to these remarks by our desire to fix some meaning for the expression a liberal man in a religious sense; for we know of no phrase more frequently used, and less understood. We shall renew the examination.

SECTION II

In our last number we made some examination of the meaning which was usually attached to this phrase. We now resume the subject.

Frequently the proper signification of an expression is only discoverable by ascertaining what it does not mean; and as every virtue is believed to consist in a happy mean, we should inquire for the virtue of liberality in a mean between extreme carelessness and infidelity on one side, and bigotry and intolerance on the other. We have examined the first extreme,—let us glance at the second.

We look upon bigotry to be an irrational attachment to doctrines, joined to a hatred of all who have not an attachment to the same doctrine. Thus, there may be bigots in true religion and in false religion. Bigotry is not the peculiarity of any sect, but is the result of criminal disposition or weakness of intellect in an individual. A person may have an irrational attachment to a true doctrine, and the doctrine is not rendered false by the unreasonableness of the individual. A person may have an irrational attachment to a doctrine, and still have no hatred to those who differ with him; such a person may be weak, but not criminal. Bigotry is criminal, and the criminality is the hatred which enters into its composition. Bigotry is a weakness, and the weakness is exhibited by the unreasonableness of the attachment. Bigotry is then an unreasonable attachment to a doctrine whether true or false, joined to hatred of those who do not hold that doctrine. It may now be asked, how can a person be unreasonably attached to a true doctrine? We answer, the truth of the doctrine may not be evident to him who embraces it, and therefore his attachment is founded upon no rational principle. We may now be told that all belief of mysteries is irrational, for their truth is not evident to man; as the very fact of their being mysteries, is an assertion that their truth is not evident. Our answer is very simple. To have evidence of the truth of a doctrine, it is sufficient that we have evidence of the capacity, knowledge, and veracity of him who delivers it, and evidence of the fact that this witness testified the truth of this doctrine; and as we thus give our assent, and form our attachment to the doctrine upon a rational principle, our belief of mysteries upon the testimony of God is rational. Thus, the man who is attached to the doctrines of religion, many of which are mysterious, may have a rational ground for that attachment. But he may also have an irrational attachment, but the quality of his attachment does not influence the intrinsic truth or falsehood of the doctrine, neither does it influence the evidence of that truth, or of that falsehood. Thus, a bigot may be

attached to true doctrine without that attachment having been produced by a rational motive; and a bigot may be attached to a false doctrine, and thus bigotry is no test of doctrinal truth; it is only an evidence of individual disposition—which disposition of hatred is criminal, whether the doctrine be true or false. Our opinion is then, that the bigot is both weak and criminal, and every bigot is an intolerant, but every intolerant is not a bigot.

The ground of our distinction is this. We call a person intolerant who has a rational attachment to a doctrine, but who hates those who differ with him in doctrine.

The evidence of truth is no warrant for hatred, especially under a system which teaches to love our enemies; and hence, even where the individual has the evidence and the conviction of truth, and thus forms a rational attachment to this truth, it is a crime for him to hate the person who rejects that truth; for though he be commanded to embrace truth, he is forbidden to hate his brother.

The intolerant or the bigot injuring the person whom he hates, is a persecutor. All persons are agreed, that the persecutor is not a liberal man. Now, as liberality is a quality of the soul, and as persecution is but the evidence of qualities of the soul exhibited by acts, the disposition which produced those acts is incompatible with the disposition of a liberal man. Hence, we may conclude that neither the bigot, nor the intolerant, nor the persecutor, can lay claim to liberality.

What, then, is liberality? We answer, a rational attachment to doctrine, without hatred or dislike of those who differ from, or reject that doctrine.

Then the liberal man is not an infidel, nor a person who is careless of discovering and embracing truth; he is not inconsisent, he is not absurd, irrational, a bigot, nor an intolerant; but he is a person who, upon rational principles, forms an attachment to a special body of doctrine, and does not molest or dislike those who differ from him. He does not sacrifice his own right of judgment, neither does he require any other person to make such a sacrifice to him. He inflicts an injury upon no man, but he is not obliged to permit others to injure him. He insults no person, but he is at liberty to prevent aggressions upon his own character, feelings, or opinions. He follows what he sees to be true; and as he loves truth, and feels it his duty to be consistent, he cannot acquiesce in the assertion that contradictions are true; and when a person who differs from him asserts that difference, though his good feeling prevents dislike, his truth prevents his becoming absurdly inconsistent, by stating, "though we diffeer in our doctrine, we are both right,"—because

the fact is they do both differ, and only one of them can be right; and the assertion of truth is as essential to the perfection of man as either charity or courtesy. The liberal man then preserves truth, and courtesy and charity at the same time. The bigot and the intolerant may preserve truth, but they destroy courtesy and charity, they embitter society, and frequently shed the blood of thousands. The infidel, latitudinarian, and the speculator in religion, may preserve courtesy and affection, but they destroy truth, and debase the human intellect.

We shall conclude this essay with a short fable, which we have made extremely simple, and we trust not, on that account, the less applicable.

It was reported in a certain city, that an extraordinary phenomenon had made its appearance in the vicinity; the inhabitants thereupon, in a public assembly, deputed three persons for the purpose of ascertaining the fact. After their return, each was called upon separately before the assembly to make his report. The first gave his statement; and one of the old citizens rising up, remarked that the gentleman must have made some mistake, for it was impossible the facts could be as he described them, and gave his opinion of the manner in which the story would have a more credible appearance; he concluded by asking the narrator, whether things might not have been as he exhibited them. The narrator, who was a polite, good-natured man, thought it would be indecorous to contradict an elderly gentleman, said very possibly he was right, especially as he had experience on his side. One of the most learned men in the city next made his remarks, differing altogether from the last speaker, and from the reporter, and concluded by asking if the view which he took was not right. He replied, he could not think of differing with so erudite a gentleman, and that probably he was himself mistaken. Four or five others gave their several views, with each of whom the good-natured man successively concurred, until the meeting was divided into as many parties as there were speakers, who ultimately agreed only in one conclusion, that the reporter who had given so many contradictory explanations, was a worthless character, who could not be depended upon.

The second was called in, and after he had delivered his report, he had to go through a similar ordeal as his predecessor; but having less patience and more influence, he soon called upon his friends to punish those insolent men who knew nothing of the facts, and could know nothing of what they had never witnessed, but which he had not only seen, but very closely examined. The tumult and uproar exceeded what had

before taken place, until at length, cuffed and bruised on all sides, he contrived to make his escape.

The third commissioner was introduced. After a cessation of hostilities had taken place, and when his report was made, several spokesmen began to controvert his assertions, to whom he calmly said, "Gentlemen, what I have stated I know; your doubts cannot destroy my convictions. I cannot force you to believe me, but I assure you my statements are correct. You are ingenious in your speculations—you are inventive in your possibilities—you are plausible in your theories; but I am convinced that I have been witness to facts, and those facts cannot be destroyed by your speculation. Had I not blazing before me the evidence of what I have examined, I might feel myself at liberty to select from amongst your theories, and some one of them might catch my imagination, or I could invent one to please my own fancy. But, gentlemen, I can never abandon the belief of a series of facts of which I have irrefragable evidence, in order to adopt a theory or system of opinions, be it ever so well constructed and alluring in its appearance; neither can I compel your assent to my statements, unless you see good reason for so doing. Let us then, in the name of God, avoid quarrels. I shall believe those truths of which I have no doubt; you, of course, will adopt systems as you please. We may live in friendship, though we cannot think alike. But, without meaning you any offence, I can never believe it possible for you to have truth on your side in your distinct contradiction of what I know to be fact. My testimony to you has not been a philosophical disquisition, but a narrative of facts."

The decision was postponed, and the meeting broke up with considerable diversity of opinion, but with peace and harmony restored.

SECTION III

LETTER

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 4, 1823.

To Daniel O'Connell Esq.

My Dear Friend:—My conscience has often smote me for having left unfulfilled a promise which you extorted from me four or five years ago, to give you in writing my notions of what is true liberality in a Roman Catholic. I have now snatched a few moments to redeem my word. I have thrown hastily together what has frequently been the result of reflections of my leisure—such as it is, it belongs to you—if worth using, to be used as you think proper. I would have extended it much more had I leisure, for I confess, I should like to have more minutely and better described that disgusting mixture of foppery, folly, infidelity, and ignorance, which at both sides of the Atlantic usurps the name of liberality. If I know my

own heart, I hold bigotry in as great abhorrence as I do infidelity or heresy, and I place the persecutor, (I care not for his creed,) at least upon the same line on the scale of immorality with the heresiarch. Yet, I acknowledge the singleness of truth, and I yield to the force of evidence.[39]

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

Liberality in religion, is the making to others the most ample concessions which truth will allow.

To deny known truth, is not liberality, it is criminal falsehood.

In revealed religion, those doctrines which God manifests to man are truths; because God could not reveal falsehood. When he reveals them they are known.

We may have such evidence of the transmission to us, of those revealed doctrines, as would enable us to be certain of their identity. When we have such evidence, those doctrines are to us known truth.

Every Roman Catholic believes that he possesses such evidence respecting the doctrines of his church. Therefore, every Roman Catholic believes, with certainty, that the doctrines of his church have been revealed by God, and, consequently, to him they are known truth; hence for him to deny such truth, would not be liberality; it would be criminal falsehood.

An algebraist sees clearly that two negative quantities multiplied will produce an affirmative or positive result. Many persons, upon hearing this asserted, would laugh at what they would consider to be contradictory, absurd, impossible. Is the scholar to give up his knowledge? Will it be liberality in him to say, "My good friends, let us not quarrel, you may be right and I may be wrong. No man is infallible. We can have no certainty. Every man has a right to his own opinion?"

This language may be fashionable; is it correct?

What should a scholar say? "Gentlemen, I have no doubt of the truth of my doctrine; I have evidence of its truth. I cannot, therefore, be in error—truth and falsehood are not matters of indifference. Reduce your principle of calculation to practice. All its correct results must inevitably be wrong. All the correct results of mine must inevitably be right. But in God's name, let us be friends. You cannot, from me, expect the assertion of a falsehood, viz., that I am wrong, and that you are right; nor can you expect from me the assertion of an absurdity, viz., that two persons who maintain contradictory propositions are both right. But we may agree to live in peace, each holding his

[39] This letter was addressed to Daniel O'Connell, the famous Irish statesman, who for many years, was a devoted friend and admirer of Bishop England. It appeared with the following essay in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, Vol. III, for 1824. —ED.

own doctrine, and using what arguments he will to support it; provided they be consistent with the public peace, with decorum, and with kind feeling."

Similar to this is the language which liberality in religion requires from the Roman Catholic, and it is the only liberal language which truth permits.

But does not the Roman Catholic Church teach that not only are her doctrines exclusively true; but, farther, that whoever will not enter into her communion will be damned? And does not she teach that they who dissent from her doctrines ought to be persecuted in this world, before they are damned in the next? and is not this the very essence of illiberality?

Each of these propositions bears the semblance of truth, and all of them put together carry with them the appearance of reasoning. We shall examine them separately for their truth, together for their consequences. Taken separately they run thus:

1st. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that her doctrines, being those which have been revealed by God, are true, and, of course, any assertion or doctrine which contradicts any of them must of necessity be false. This is conceded—such is the fact.

2d. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that whosoever will not enter into, and is not found in her communion, will be damned.

The Roman Catholic Church does not teach this proposition in several meanings which it is calculated to convey. In fact, the Roman Catholic Church teaches no such proposition. But she teaches that "faith is necessary to salvation," that "without the true faith no person can be saved." In the words of St. Paul, "that without faith it is impossible to please God." Now, these latter propositions differ essentially from that which is marked No. 2.

But what is the extent of the latter propositions? Exactly the extent of their subject, in the proposition which is their equivalent, "Only those persons who have faith are capable of salvation." The extent of the subject then is, all they who have faith. To discover them we must know what the Roman Catholic Church means by faith. She teaches that "faith is the sincere disposition to believe all that God has taught."

Therefore the Roman Catholic Church extends the capacity for salvation to all those who are sincerely disposed to believe all that God has taught. She calls those persons who will not believe in revelation, and who therefore reject all the doctrines, infidels: because they have no faith in what God has said. She calls those who believe some of the doctrines of revelation, and disbelieve the rest, heretics—that is choosers,

from the Greek verb αἱρεω, to choose, because, instead of faithfully receiving all, they make choices, some receiving what others reject, and all being led by fancy, not by evidence of testimony; thus no one of them receives all, and most of them differ in their selections. She calls those who receive all the doctrines, Faithful, and also Catholics. There can be no illiberality in using appropriate names, whose etymology accurately designates, without any reproach or obloquy, those who, in fact, differ, and who, therefore, must be accurately and differently described.

We now inquire, does the Roman Catholic Church confine this disposition to believe all that God has taught to those who profess her faith and who live in her external communion? She does not. If such be the case, she then does not confine capacity for salvation to those persons. In order to understand the assertion, "she does not," let us inquire what are her limits? Thus we shall know whom she excludes.

A new and a most important distinction now presents itself to us, between those who give evidence of their dispositions, and those who, having the disposition, do not exhibit the evidence, for, it is plain, a disposition may exist of whose existence we do not discover evidence.

All they who openly profess the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, are by her rationally considered to have faith; because they have, by their profession, declared their belief of all that God has taught. Those persons are properly considered as having that disposition, of whose existence they have given positive evidence. But although they are thus looked upon as capable of salvation, their actual enjoyment thereof is not secured by their capacity. They must do all those acts which will insure the enjoyment of eternal life, otherwise, though salvation be within their reach, they will not be saved.

Others, it is true, may have the disposition, without giving the evidence; the church can judge only upon evidence. They give none. She decides rationally upon the principle, *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.* There is no capacity for salvation. Some of those persons answer, we have faith. We believe, but we do not believe all that you teach. She proposes to them doctrines which she is certain are the revelation of God. Those persons dissent; they reject the doctrines. Here is a case not merely of want of evidence, for there is here distinct evidence of rejecting doctrines taught by God; she is, therefore, fully warranted in deciding as reason compels: "there is here no faith."

Does she not then teach distinctly, that every individual who does not believe all her doctrines and profess her religion will be damned? No. Because her conclusion is not metaphysically, it is only morally

universal; and is not, therefore, applicable to every special case, though it be applicable to the generality of cases. The general conclusion is by strict logical deduction, inevitable from the scriptural principle, that—"without faith it is impossible to please God." But, we cannot say the same of special conclusions, because there may, and actually do exist a number of cases, many of which, I am convinced, have fallen under my own observation, in which the disposition to believe exists, but where the usual evidence of that disposition cannot be given. In many more, I am inclined to think, the disposition may exist, without any possibility of obtaining evidence thereof.

I shall give a few examples.

1st. A person to whom the doctrine was never preached, may have the disposition to believe.

2d. A person to whom the doctrine was misrepresented, may be disposed to believe, though he may, from being told that the church taught absurdities and contradictions, and immoral principles, be disgusted with what he was taught were her doctrines, and be without the opportunity of correcting his errors.

3d. A person of weak or perverted intellect may have the disposition to believe, and at the same time may mistake error for truth.

Other instances might be added, in which the disposition may exist, but the evidence not be given. None of those persons profess the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, yet that church extends to them, as well as to those who profess her doctrines, capacity for salvation; therefore she does not confine that capacity to those in her external communion.

But, although the church does not possess evidence by which she can discern those individuals, and upon which she could pronounce them to be members of her body, yet they are a portion of her soul. God, who searches the hearts of men, and who knows their disposition, discerns them; grants to them the benefit of their faith; and though they are not acknowledged as visible members, yet they are claimed as truly within the pale of the church. Thus the general propositions are true: "Without faith it is impossible to please God." "Out of the church there is no salvation." "The Roman Catholic Church is the only true church." "All persons are obliged to be members of the one true church." Yet the church would condemn as rash, presumptuous, illiberal, uncharitable, dangerous, and unjustifiable, the special conclusion: "But this individual is not in the church. Therefore this individual will be damned."

Whatever probabilities may exhibit themselves to our judgment, we

can have no certainty of the truth of the second proposition, "But this individual is not in the church," and, without a certainty of its truth, we can never arrive at the special conclusion. It is true, we may know that he does not belong to the body; he is not in the external communion; but, whatever may be the force of probable circumstances, not even sometimes the declaration of the individual himself; in many cases, nothing short of supernatural revelation, can give us a certainty that he does not belong to the soul of the church. Therefore, although a Roman Catholic does believe that it is necessary for salvation to be a member of the true church, and that the Roman Catholic Church only is that true church: still he does not hold, nor is he obliged to believe, that every person who is not in her external communion will be damned; nor will truth require, nor charity justify, his forming special conclusions. He knows not who will be damned. The eternal condemnation of the wicked, is the prerogative exclusively of God; and one which man cannot usurp.

Nothing herein contained can excuse, or even extenuate, the heavy criminality of those who are careless in seeking after the true church; or who, having discovered it, basely and wickedly neglect to bear testimony to God's truth, through mean or mercenary human motives.

3d. We now come to the next proposition: "The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the dissenters from her doctrines ought to be persecuted in this world, before they are damned in the next."

She teaches no such doctrine.

Does she not anathematize and curse all heretics? No. She anathematizes, that is, rejects, detests, condemns, and reprobates heresy, and not heretics. The erroneous doctrine, not the individuals. The doctrine may be detested, and execrated, and condemned, whilst the persons who have been innocently led to its adoption, may be pitied and beloved. The original seducer, the heresiarch, who, in his pride and malice, devised the error, and obstinately, and contumaciously, and cunningly led others to adopt, and they who, in like manner, plainly exhibit the malice of depravity, may be condemned and reprobated without lessening the pity, or affection, for those whom they seduce.

Let me suppose a person mixes a deleterious intoxicating draught, and induces many to partake of it, under the expectation, on their part, of improving their health; suppose I warn those deluded persons, whom he invites to take his potation; suppose I threaten my children with my displeasure, should they yield to the seduction; suppose him to be aided in his plans by men of plausible appearance, who proclaim me to be a jealous tyrant, who would deprive my children, and all others, of the

benefits which this amalgamator would confer, because those benefits are not of my own invention; suppose my admonitions and threats to be disregarded, and that I see my friends, and my children, raving and pining in their intoxication: can I not condemn the seducer, and his assistants, and execrate the poisonous beverage, whilst at the same time I weep over my friends, and lament, and love, and pity them and my children? And can I not describe, and bewail, what I foresee will be the consequences of their misconduct, without being justly chargeable with desiring those consequences? These are consequences which I cannot avoid foreseeing, and which I am anxious to avert; but which, from the plans of the seducer, and the strength of the poison, and the lamentable delusion of my friends, and of my childreen, I am unable to prevent.

If a Roman Catholic finds persons seduced into error of doctrine, and tells them that the consequences of their losing their faith will be perdition, is it not rather evidence of his sincere desire to save them from ruin, than of a wish to plunge them into damnation? If a man walks carelessly towards the brink of a precipice, is it my wish that he should be dashed to pieces, because I cry out to inform him that he will inevitably be lost, if he proceeds? Suppose I saw him advancing, and knew the consequences, and calmly looked on in silence, or carelessly and smilingly told him that, indeed, all the paths were equally safe, and that he ought to walk where he chose, and he fell and was destroyed; would my silence, or my delusive flattery, be charity, benevolence, liberality?

Thus the Roman Catholic is not illiberal. First—"When he asserts the exclusive truth of his doctrines." Secondly—"When he publishes the consequences of error in faith." As well might the robber charge the moralist with illiberality for publishing damnation to be the consequence of robbery. If God declares the penalty for the transgression, there can be no illiberality in stating that fact of God's declaration. Thirdly—"Nor does his religion require of a Roman Catholic to believe that any individual out of the external communion of his church will be damned." Fourthly, "Nor is his condemnation of heresy evidence of his dislike of the deluded individual who professes the erroneous doctrine."

But does not his religion require of him to hate all those whom he knows to be doomed to damnation? Does it not oblige him to hate all God's enemies, and is not every heretic an enemy to God?

His religion does not require of him to hate any person, but it commands him to love all persons, and to do good to all; nor could he, if that obligation of hatred were his principle, reduce it to practice. The prin-

ciple would oblige him to hate millions of his fellow Catholics, because, unfortunately, amongst them there are millions whose corruption of life is detestable, and who are greater enemies to God than are numbers of heretics and infidels. Millions of Catholics, whose misconduct will insure their damnation. How many hypocrites are there, with sanctified exterior, and filled with rottenness, concealed from the eye of man. By the imputed principle, all those must be hated. How shall they be known? Thousands who lived in error during many years, ultimately embraced truth, and became the brightest ornaments of the church. From the East and West they came to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the children of the kingdom are cast out. How shall we draw the bounding line which must separate those who stand together; now in infidelity; now in heresy; now in Catholicity? All who live in the profession of infidelity are not infidels. All who live in the profession of heresy are not heretics. All who live in the profession of Catholicism are not Catholics. We have before seen several grounds of exception on one side; there are some upon the other; and many individuals stand upon each of these grounds. We could not, therefore, know whom to hate, were there an obligation of hatred. The principle is false, and even if true, it would be impracticable as a rule of conduct. It is false, for the gospel tells us we must hate no person. Though we may reprobate the conduct of many, we must love all. And that gospel is the code which contains the principles of the Roman Catholic. To that gospel the imputed principle is a plain contradiction. The principles of Roman Catholics are not contradictory.

What then is religious liberality? The assertion of truth—the rejection of error—the love of all mankind, without the sacrifice of our principle. In a word, it is Christian charity. It first loves God and his truth, and adheres firmly to his revelation. It next exhibits the practical love of every individual of the human race, without excluding sect or nation from benevolence of feeling and exertion for their welfare. It accords with evidence, it is allied to consistency, it urges us to search for the revealed doctrines of God, to believe and to profess them: when likely to be profitable to others to manifest them; when such manifestation would be practically useless, or be injurious, to continue silent. It forbids us to flatter vice, or to encourage error. It commands us to hate no man—to persecute no man—to live in harmony with all men—to assist as far as we can, those who need it; whether their religious belief be correct or erroneous; to practise the duties of religion at the proper time and in the proper place; not to make of them an ostentatious exhibition; yet to give good example; not to annoy others by prying

into their belief or conduct, except when our station makes it our duty; not to limit our friendship and good-will to those only who agree with us in faith: and whilst we endeavour to regulate our own conduct with propriety, to avoid speaking of the faults, or judging of the practice, or the claims to salvation of our neighbour.

In a word, religious liberality teaches us to do unto all men as we would they should do unto us. This is the liberality of a Roman Catholic. It is not that unreasonable, unmeasured abandonment of every principle of common sense, and of religion, which places truth and falsehood upon a level; and rushing blindly from the extravagance of bigotry, to the extreme of folly, declaims much but means nothing; which puts contradictions in juxtaposition, and is unable, or unwilling, to perceive the absurdity. Which lavishly bestows everything to every claimant, and preserving nothing for itself, soon is found to be destitute of reason, consistency, even of common decorum. True liberality is to make every human being the utmost concession which truth, justice, and decency will permit.

In the above observations I have assumed, as granted, what could be proved with facility, and what every Roman Catholic is bound to believe, viz.: "That every doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church has been revealed by God."

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the library rules or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.

DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE	DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE
	APR 16 195		

C28 (1149) 100M

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
0035519053
BRITTLE DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

·936 En34
v.5